A CRITICAL STUDY OF

Naccinārkkiniyar

K. ARUMUGHAM

UNIVERSITY OF MADRAS

A CRITICAL STUDY OF NACCINĀRKKINIYAR

By
Dr. K. ARUMUGHAM

Editor

Dr. C. BALASUBRAMANIAN
Professor & Head Dept. of Tamil Language
University of Madras

Assistance

Dr. E. SUNDARAMOORTHY

UNIVERSITY OF MADRAS

1981

Madras University Tamil Department Series No. 46

A CRITICAL STUDY OF NACCIṈĀRKKIṈIYAR

Thesis submitted for the Ph. D. Degree

University of Madras

January, 1965

A CRITICAL STUDY
OF
NACCIṈĀRKKIṈIYAR

By

Dr. K. ARUMUGHAM

Dept. of Tamil, University of Delhi

UNIVERSITY OF MADRAS

1981

© University of Madras 1981

Price Rs. 16/-

PRINTED IN INDIA
AT AVVAI ACHUKKOODAM, 17, P. V. KOIL STREET, MADRAS-600013.

CONTENTS

Page

CHAPTER-1 Introduction ... 1-23

1.1 *Naccinārkkiniyar as a commentator* - Earlier works and their commentaries - Iḷampūraṇar and his successors- A critical study of Naccinārkkiniyar.

1.2 *The history of Naccinārkkiniyar* - Naccinārkkiniyar's religion etc. - The religious tolerance of Naccinārkkiniyar - The period of Naccinārkkiniyar.

1.3 *The works of Naccinārkkiniyar* - Has he written a commentary on Tirukkōvaiyār - His earliest commentary that on Tolkāppiyam - The commentary on Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi - The commentaries on Pattuppāṭṭu and Kalittokai - The commentaries on Pattuppāṭṭu and Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi - The com-mentaries on Kalittokai and Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi.

1.4 *Naccinārkkiniyar's scholarship in Sanskrit* - Sanskrit derivations - Sanskrit explanations - Forced interpretations- Sanskrit traditions.

1.5 *Naccinārkkiniyar's knowledge in other fields* - Political knowledge - Knowledge of society - Religious knowledge - Knowledge of natural and physical sciences.

1.6 *The works on Naccinārkkiniyar* - Dr. U.V.S. Iyer's references - S. S. W. P. Society's 'Lecture compilations' - Other research studies - Criticism.

1.7 *The main approach and contribution of the Thesis* - Inductive criticism followed - Partly judicial criticism - Some of the important original contributions of the thesis.

PART I

NACCINĀRKKINIYAR AS A LITERARY CRITIC

CHAPTER-2 Appreciation of poetry ... 24-52

2.1 *The emphasis on the highest ideals* - Chastity lights up the world - Contradiction to Dharma - Chastity for men.

2.2 *Resolving contradictions* - Implied contradiction - Explicit contradiction - oxymoron - Idiomatic contradiction - Contradicting nature.

2.3 *The function of ambiguous verbs* - Vēynalam iḻanta tōḷ - Puṇ tavaḷ vēl kaṇ pāvai - Mai paṭu perum tōḷ maḻavar - Uṇṇunar-t-taṭutta nuvaṇai - Pūṇ aṇi mārpa - Mulai vaitta taṭam.

2.4 *The importance of poetic names* - Vaḷḷal - Puravalaṉ - Cilaivalāy - Cilaivittakaṉē - Makkaḷ and Mākkaḷ - Maṭam.

2.5 *The significance of attributes* - Same attribute with different meanings - Attribute with special significance - Words with and without attributes-Contradictory attributes - Ill placed attributes - Attributes with different meanings.

2.6 *Demonstratives and interrogatives* - The demonstrative 'a' - The demonstratives 'aṉṉa', 'iṉṉa', - The demonstrative 'īṅku' - The interrogative 'eṉ' - Demonstrative with interrogative.

2.7 *Singular plural mixture* - Singular for plural - Plural for singular.

2.8 *The scope of compound words* - Kaṭuntiṟal nōykaḷum - Kaṭṭil - Kāvalaṉ - Muṉivarum - Niṉaintirukkum - Uyttiṭṭaṉar - Maṟantiruntār.

2.9 *The splitting of sentences* - Iṉyāḷ itu uyttukkoṭumō - Cunantai nī avvai allai.

2.10 *Humour* - Rotating the hot mutton between the cheeks - New man is really the old man - Kingdom of rags - The old baffalo - Satire : The swan and the conch - Smiling - Tāṉam - Tirunakar-c-celva.

CHAPTER-3 Similes and Metaphors ... 53-78

3.1 *Simile; its origin, base etc.* - The origin of simile - Viravivarutal (multiple simile) - Uvamai nilaikkaḷaṉ (The basis of simile) - Comparison of various things to one thing specific - Comparison of several actions to a specific action.

3.2 *Some kinds of simile* - Similes of impossible - Simile of proverbs - Cilēṭai-(Pun)-uvamai.

3.3 *Iraṭṭai uvamai (Two fold similes)* - The thing and comparison with attributes - The epithets of the upamāṉam applied to the upamēyam also - The attribute of the

upamēyam applied to the upamāṉam - The attribute of the upamāṉam taken to upamēyam and the attribute of the upamēyam taken to upamāṉam in one and the same simile.

3.4 *Inferred similes* - Upamēyam inferred from upamāṉam - Upamāṉam inferred from upamēyam - Upamāṉam and upamēyam both inferred from the context.

3.5 *Similes of suggestion* - More ideas suggested by a simile - Subtle points of similarity - A striking point of similarity.

3.6 *Making the dead similes alive* - Reference to what follows- Reference to what precedes.

3.7 *Different suggestions for the same simile according to the context* - The sun - Similes with alternate suggestions - Refusing to read a simile.

3.8 *An assessment of some interpretations* - Interpretation of similes on the basis of culture - Prosaic interpretation of simile.

3.9 *Metaphor : its origin, base etc.* - The distinction between metaphor and simile - The usage of metaphor and the duty of the commentator - Metaphor (Nouns) - Ekatēsa uruvakam (Partial metaphor) - Metaphor - Verbs - Clarification of points of similarity - Metaphor on the basis of the ideal.

CHAPTER-4 Synonymy and Polysemy ... 79-102

4.1 *Synonyms* - Synonyms not repetitions - Synonyms not substitutes - Methods of interpreting synonyms.

4.2 *Different but allied meanings* - Paṇpu-p-peyar (nouns of quality) - The words denoting 'beauty' - The words denoting 'childhood' - Two kinds of 'words' - The words denoting 'anger' - The words denoting 'enmity' - The words denoting 'misery' - The words denoting 'strong' - The words denoting 'victory' - The words denoting 'sound' - The words denoting 'attachment' - The words denoting 'poverty'.

Nouns other than paṇpu - Malar and Mālai – Nouns of places - Nouns - mountain - Other nouns.

Verbs with allied meanings - Some other methods for differentiating the words with allied meanings - One as the attribute of the other - Differentiation of repeated nouns - Differentiation of repeated verbs.

4.3 *Different meanings but not allied - Nouns of quality* - Various nouns differentiated - Making one of the Paṇpus a verb - Making one of the Paṇpus, the thing possessing the Paṇpu.

Nouns other than Paṇpu - Interpreting different meanings - Making one of the two nouns, a quality - Making one of the two nouns, an attribute - Making one of the nouns, a verb.

Verbs - Interpretation of different meanings - Making one of the two verbs an uri-c-col - Other reasons.

4.4 *Avoidance of repetition of meanings by taking the sentence as elliptical* - The subject of one of the two verbs - The Subjects of both the verbs - The object of the one of the two verbs - The objects of both the verbs - The special noun for a general word - The things referred to by the demonstratives derived - Cause and effect—derived.

4.5 *Dislodgement of synonymous words or 'Poetic inversion'* - Nouns of quality - The nouns other than paṇpu - The verbs - Noun and verb - Iṭai-c-col.

4.6 *Non differentiation of apparent synonyms* - Repetition denoting intensity - Repetition denoting continuity - Repetition showing emotion - Superlative degree - Emphasis with a purpose - Is differentiation obvious? - Difference not pointed out.

4.7 *Polysemy* - Ambiguity avoided - Pointing out the various meanings - Various meanings not mentioned.

PART—II

NACCINĀRKKINIYAR AS A CRITICAL GRAMMARIAN

CHAPTER-5 Traditional methods of Criticism ... 103-128

5.1 *Objections and clarifications* - Conflict with grammar - Conflict with literary usage - The statement seemingly self-contradictory - Circumlocutory or complex statement - The statement being seemingly not comprehensive - The statement being seemingly superfluous.

5.2 *Doubts and clarifications* - Ambiguities cleared by the author himself - Vēṟṟumai-t-tokai or ummai-t-tokai? - Vēṟṟumai-t-tokai or uvamai-t-tokai? - Address to the guardsman or to the patron? - Whether ōmpaṭai can come under pāṭāṇ? - Āṇpāṟkāñci or Peṇpāṟkāñci? - Doubts that could not be cleared.

5.3 *Refutation of misinterpretations* - Kūṟiyatu kūṟal (Tautology) - Māṟukoḷakkūṟal (contradictory statements) - Mayaṅka-k-kūṟal (obscurity in literary composition) - In contradiction to the authors idea-contradicition to human nature.

5.4 *A discussion of differences* - Difference of letters (Homophones) - Technical terms defined and differentiated - Ākupeyar and aṉmoḻi-t-tokai - Peyar and uri - Uraiya-cai and acainilai - Differentiation of allomorphs - Homonyms of ambiguity resolved by grammatical category - The word 'yār' - The words 'uṇṭu' and 'iṉṟu' - Paṇai and uṭaimai - Poruḷ and poruṇmai - Homonyms of ambiguity resolved by sandhi rules - Uḷakkiṉ kuṟai and uḷakkiṟkuṟai - Irāa-k-kākkai and irā-k-kākkai - Āyiṭai - Root morphemes differentiated-Suffix morphemes differentiated.

5.5 *Superfluity or other sources for more ideas* - The importance of superfluity - Superfluity- a fiction - The terms like "Niṉaiyuṅkālai" ('as considered') - The terms like "Iṭaṉuṭaiya" ('there are places') - The terms like "Teḷlitu" ('clear') - The phrases like "Iṉṉapiṟa" ('such like) – Superfluity from previous sūtram - Repetition as superfluity - Synonyms as superfluity.

CHAPTER-6 Conventional Devices of Interpretation ... 129-151

6.1 *Paṉmai kūṟal* (*Implication of the Plural Form*) -Agreement with his predecessors - Further implications suggested - Different implications suggested - Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar's original implications - Interpretation in terms of literary usage - Plural denoting the fore fathers – Unwarranted interpretation.

6.2 *Kūṟiyatu kūṟal* (*Repetition*) - No repetition - Repetition for emphasis - Repetition for clarification - Repetition with a purpose - Repetition differing from others - Repetition in a single line.

6.3 *Etirmaṟuttu k-kūṟal* (*artāpātti*)-Independent observations-Differs from Iḷampūraṇar - Differing from Cēṉāvaraiyar - Natural and artificial regions and seasons - Interpretation on literary basis.

6.4 *Uyttukkoṇṭuṇartal* (*Interpretation by extension or inference*) - Second idea derived - Differing from Cēṉāvaraiyar - Explicit meaning derived.

6.5 *Iraṭṭuṟa moḻital* (*Statement which is capable of two different meanings*) - The method referred to – The method not referred to.

6.6 *Oṉṟeṉa muṭittal* (*Mentioning of similarities*) - New ideas added.

6.7 *Taṉṉiṉa muṭittal* (*Including others of the same category*) - Related points covered - Differing from Iḷampūraṇar.

6.8 *Vēṇṭātu kūṟal* (*Superfluous statements*) - Agreement with the predecessors - Original suggestions.

6.9 *Varaiyātu kūṟal* (*unrestricted statements*) - Agreement with the predecessors - Original additions.

6.10 *Potuppaṭa-k-kūṟal* (*Generalisation*) - Uṟaḷum Kiḷavi (refutation or retort) - Tiṇaimayakkuṟutal (mingling of tiṇais).

6.11 *Moḻiyātatu muṭittal* (*Mentioning what is not mentioned*) - Importance of both the views.

6.12 *Oppakkūṟal* (*Mentioning of parallels*) - Alar kūṟutal between kaḷavu and kaṟpu.

CHAPTER-7 A Critical review of Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar's views ... 152-184

7.1 *A study of ākupeyar* - Ākupeyar with an attribute - Interpretation of aṭai aṭutta ākupeyar – Ākupeyar occurring as an attribute - Ākupeyar-from the point of view of synonymy - Ākupeyar-from the point of view of polysemy - Ākupeyar-is it traditional? - Ākupeyar-a forced interpretation - Iyaṟpeyar or ākupeyar - Participial nouns or ākupeyar - Are numerals ākupeyar? - Is there any basis for ākupeyar?

7.2 *A note on tense* - Ceyteṉ eccam and its tense - ceyteṉ eccam denoting present-Ceyteṉ eccam denoting future-Tense of 'Ceya' type of participles - Literary evidence for 'ceya' type in present - Literary evidence for 'ceya' type in future - A subtle point in the tense of 'ceya' type - Conclusions.

7.3 *A study of 'um'* – Ecca ummai ('um' denoting incompletion) - Different interpretations for 'um' – 'Um' denoting muṟṟu and eccam (completion and incompletion) - 'Um' denoting eccam and iḻivuciṟappu (incompletion and meanness) - 'Um' taken to other place or places - Displacement of 'um' - 'Um' denoting etirmaṟai (negation) - Frequency and non frequency - Balance.

7.4 *The significance of 'māṭṭēṟu' (application)* Application - similarity of the rules : limited - Application - similarity of the rules : extended-Application: regular-Application: irregular : Application - proximate.

7.5 *The order of placing - The various kinds of order* - Arrangement of similar things together - Arrangement of similar things at different places - Occurrence of a similar thing between the sequence - Occurrence of a different thing between the sequence - Arrangement of a thing at the end of a category or at the beginning of the next category.

The reasons for the order of placing - Importance - The importance of what is stated first - The importance of what is stated at the end - The importance of what is stated in the middle - Affinity - Tokai and viri (summing up and elaboration) - Frequency and non-frequency - Cause and effect.

Seemingly irrelevant order - Chapter affinity - Māṭṭēṟu or Application - Statement in one place - Frequency and non-frequency – Other suggestions.

PART—III

NACCIṈĀRKKIṈIYAR AS A LINGUIST

CHAPTER-8. Phonology ... 185-203

8.1 *A few ancient conceptions* - Vaḷiyum icaiyum (Breath and sound) - Place of origin of sounds – The form of sounds - The importance of 'a' sound - The sound system of syllabic sounds (uyirmey).

8.2 *Intonation* - Phonemes and allophones in Tamil - Several kinds of intonation - Contrast - due to eṭuttal and paṭuttal ōcai - Imperative verbs and verbal nouns - Quantity of length system of some roots - Finite verbs and participial nouns - Transitive and intransitive verbs - Second personal verb and imperative - Affirmative and negative second personal verbs - Finite and non-finite verbs - Some verbal forms common to many parts of speech.

8.3 *Juncture* - The two major groups of juncture - Juncture as a phoneme - Meanings understood through intonation - Is there any pitch difference ? – Meanings understood by context - Oṭṭimuṭital (Close juncture) Piḷantu muṭital (Open Juncture) - The Juncture of

the phrases where the suffixes are not elided - Two kinds of compound.

CHAPTER-9 Syntax ... 204–232

9.1 *Sentences* - Morphology and Syntax - Word Definition : Sentence : Definition - Taḷuvu toṭor (Phrase in which a word qualifies the word immediately following it) - Taḷāttoṭar (Phrase in which a word does not qualify the word immediately following it) : Constituents in verses - Māṭṭu - Proximate māṭṭu - Distant māṭṭu.

9.2 *Major types af sentences* - Taṉi moḻi (sentence words) - Toṭar moḻi (Sentences of more than one word).

9.3 *Eḻuvāy- Payaṉilai-t-toṭar (Subject-predicate construction)* - Different kinds of grammatical predicates - Additional varieties of predicates – Types of subjects - Commander actor – Noun occurring as predicate.

9.4 *Attribute construction* - Ambiguities removed - The homophonous construction resolved - A series of attributes - nonambiguous - Ambiguous interpretation - The attribute of the part as the attribute of the whole - An idiom (a) Attribute with a latent and not patent significance - The attributes merely suggestive of the pun - An idiom (b) Attribute and Head as a common noun – Relative participle + Noun as Attribute and Head - Cause and effect construction - Effect and cause construction.

9.5 *Concordance or Agreement* - Tiṇai, Pāl, eṇ. iṭam - Vaḻānilai, vaḻu, vaḻuvamaiti - Akṟiṇai viravu-p-peyar - Cāti orumai (species-singular) - Cāti-p-paṉmai (more than one species) - Cross reference : number - Cross reference: tiṇai and number - Cross reference - tiṇai. number - ambiguous.

9.6 *Change of order of words in poetry* - Ordinary and literary usages - Classification of syntax in poetry - Āṟṟolukku (the natural order) - Niralnirai - Moḻimāṟṟu and māṭṭu.

Displacement of the order - To emphasize the 'Topic' - To emphasize the logical order - cause and effect - To avoid irrelevance of similies - To conform to history.

CHAPTER-10 Semantic Changes ... 233–254

10.1 *Words and their meanings* - All words have meanings - The way in which words convey their meanings -

words referring to their meanings - Words referring to their forms - Classification of meaning.

10.2 *Changes of meaning* - The subjective for the objective - The objective for the subjective - Wearing out of a hyperbole - Its opposite - an euphemism - General for the specific (Restriction or narrowing) - Specific for the general (Expansion or widening) - The whole for the part - The part for the whole - Activity attributed to inactive things - An activity not its own attributed to a thing - Another variety of this attribution - The cause for the efiect - The effect for the cause - Affirmative for negative - Negative for affirmative - The place used for the time - The place for the thing in the place - A thing in a place for its abstract quality.

10.3 *Grammatical changes* - Exclusive and inclusive First person - Third person used for the other persons - Taṉmai-p-paṭarkkai (first personal third person) - Muṉṉilai-p-paṭarkkai (second personal third person) - First person in the third personal verbs - Third person in the first and second - Reconcilation with Tolkāppiyam sūtram - Non-ergative for the ergative - The ergative for the non-ergative - Another change - Ceyyum - as viyaṅkōl - Ceyyum - as second person plural.

BIBLIOGRAPHY 255-260

ABBREVIATIONS

1.	Aiṅk	Aiṅkuṟunūṟu
2.	Akam	Akanāṉūṟu
3.	Caṅkara	Caṅkaranamaccivāyar commentary
4.	Cēnā	Cēnāvaraiyar commentary
5.	Ciṟupāṇ	Ciṟupāṇāṟṟuppaṭai
6.	Civa	Civañāṉamuṉivar commentary
7.	Col	Collatikāram
8.	Eḻuttu	Eḻuttatikāram
9.	Iḷam	Iḷampūraṇar commentary
10.	Iṟaiyaṉār	Iṟaiyaṉār Kaḷaviyal
11.	Jīvaka	Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi
12.	Kali	Kalittokai
13.	Kampar	Kamparāmāyaṇam
14.	Kuṟaḷ	Tirukkuṟaḷ
15.	Kuṟiñci	Kuṟiñci-p-pāṭṭu
16.	Malai	Malaipaṭukaṭām
17.	Maturai	Maturai-k-kāñci
18.	Mullai	Mullai-p-pāṭṭu
19.	Muruku	Tirumurukāṟṟuppaṭai
20.	Nac	Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar commentary
21.	Neṭu	Neṭunalvāṭai
22.	Pari	Parimèlaḷakar commentary
23.	Paṭṭiṉam	Paṭṭiṉappālai
24.	Pērā	Pērāciriyar commentary
25.	Perumpāṇ	Perumpāṇāṟṟuppaṭai
26.	Poruḷ	Poruḷatikāram
27.	Porunar	Porunarāṟṟuppaṭai
28.	Puṟam	Puṟanāṉūṟu
29.	Teyva	Teyvaccilaiyār commentary
30.	The Tamil concept of love	The Tamil concept of love in Ahatti-ṇai.
31.	Tol	Tolkāppiyam

TRANSLITERATION

Vowels

அ	—	a	எ	—	e
ஆ	—	ā	ஏ	—	ē
இ	—	i	ஐ	—	ai
ஈ	—	ī	ஒ	—	o
உ	—	u	ஓ	—	ō
ஊ	—	ū	ஔ	—	au
			ஃ	—	k

Consonants

க்	—	k	ம்	—	m
ங்	—	ṅ	ய்	—	y
ச்	—	c	ர்	—	r
ஞ்	—	ñ	ல்	—	l
ட்	—	ṭ	வ்	—	v
ண்	—	ṇ	ழ்	—	ḻ
த்	—	t	ள்	—	ḷ
ந்	—	n	ற்	—	ṟ
ப்	—	p	ன்	—	ṉ

Sanskrit

ஜ	—	j
ஸ்	—	s
ஷ்	—	ṣ
க்ஷ	—	ksh
ஹ்	—	h

A NOTE ON REFERENCES

1. References to Tolkāppiyam and other works and wherever necessary, to the commentaries on them, are made under the number of the sūtram, verse or line as given in the respective commentaries.

2. Where the name of the commentator is not mentioned, the reference to sūtram, verse or line follows the numbering as found in the commentary of Naccinārkkiniyar.

3. Where the sūtram or verse contains many lines, the lines, the line number is also given; e.g. 14 : 7, 15 : 3-9.

4. Where the sūtram or the verse and the commentary thereon are at different places, the sūtram or verse number is given along with the page number where the commentary is found.

5. References to passages in the thesis are given under the numbers of chapter, section and paragraph (e.g. 2. 3. 5 means Chapter - 2, Section - 3, Paragraph - 5).

6. In the chapter on phonology, superior figures indicating pitch levels are found before and after the word or phrase, while superior figures as reference numbers are found only at the end.

7. The following abbreviations are used in this thesis :—

l.	ll.	—	for line, lines.
p,	pp.	—	for page, pages.
s.	ss.	—	for sūtram, sūtrams.
v.	vv.	—	for verses.

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER—1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. *Naccinarkkiniyar as a Commentator*

1.1.1. *Earlier works and their Commentaries*

"A critical study of Naccinārkkiniyar" is the subject chosen for treatment in this thesis. He has written commentaries on Tolkāppiyam, Pattuppāṭṭu, Kalittokai and Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi. Tolkāppiyam is the earliest grammatical work extant in Tamil. Pattuppāṭṭu and Eṭṭuttokai, which are anthologies, are the earliest literary works now extant. Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi, Cilappatikāram, Maṇimēkalai, Vaḷaiyāpati and Kuṇṭalakēci, the five major Kāvyas or the aimperuṅkāppiyam as they are known now, succeeded the Saṅgam works. The language of all these works differs from the language of the later period, in the same way that old English does from modern English. A knowledge of modern or even medieval Tamil will not suffice to understand the ancient works. But we are fortunate in our commentators who have explored these dark obscure regions with the torch of traditional wisdom. To vary the metaphor, their commentaries serve as telescopes bringing remote centuries within our vision and understanding.

1.1.2. *Iḷampūraṇar and his successors*

Iḷampūraṇar is the earliest known commentator on Tolkāppiyam. It is significant that he is known as Uraiyāciriyar ('The Commentator')[1]. The rich mine of Tolkāppiyam, hidden beneath the sands of Time, was revealed by the magic touch of Iḷampūraṇar and he was followed by Pērāciriyar, Cēṉāvaraiyar, Naccinārkkiniyar, Kallāṭar and Teyvaccilaiyār. Of these Naccinārkkiniyar is the only scholar who has written commentaries on both literature and grammar, and the present study concerns itself with an investigation of his commentaries.

---

1. Tol. Poruḷ. Iḷam; Introduction; p. 12.
   Tol. Col. Iḷam. Introduction; p. iii.
   Tol. Eḻuttu. Iḷam. Introduction; p. 2.

1.1.3. *A critical study of Naccinārkkiniyar*

Naccinārkkiniyar's commentary on Pattuppāṭṭu was studied to some extent in another thesis on Pattuppāṭṭu for M.Litt. Degree. This led the present writer to a detailed study of the commentaries of Naccinārkkiniyar on other works. Professor T. P. Meenakshisundaram who went through the thesis for M.Litt. Degree and Dr. M. Varadarajan who assessed it, suggested a full length study of Naccinārkkiniyar and hence this present thesis "A critical study of Naccinārkkiniyar".

1.2. *The History of Naccinārkkiniyar*

Though the life history of Naccinārkkiniyar has never been separately written, yet the scholars who have edited Pattuppāṭṭu, Kalittokai, Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi and Tolkāppiyam with his commentaries, have given short biographical sketches of this great commentator. As this thesis confines itself to a study of his commentaries, only a short resume of his biography as far as it is-known now, is given below.

1.2.1. *Naccinārkkiniyar's religion etc.*

Naccinārkkiniyar, a Brahmin by birth, belonging to Bhāradvāja gōtra, was born in Maturai. He was a learned scholar, well-versed in the grammatical and literary works in Tamil. He described himself at the end of his commentaries thus: "Maturai Āciriyar Bhāradvāci Naccinārkkiniyar ceyta urai".[1] "He is a Saivite. He gives Tiruccirrampalam and Perumparrapuliyūr as instances of six lettered and seven lettered words in his commentary on Tolkāppiyam. His quoting extensively from Tiruvācakam, Tiruccirrampalakkōvaiyār, Tiruvulāppuram, etc. to explain certain philosophical truths, and his special notes on the poem (362, 1141) in Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi and certain observations in Tirumurukārrupaṭai, prove that he was a Saivite".[2] Also whenever there is a reference to Lord Siva in Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi and other works, he refers to Him as 'Iraivan' ('The Supreme Lord').[3] "In the Tolkāppiyam sūtram, specifying 'separation for the sake of learning', the commentary of Naccinārkkiniyar refers to 'Tatvamaci' which indicates 'Advaita', and the Advaitists are Siva worshippers".[4] But 'Tatvam aci' occurs in the upanishad and this is accepted as authoritative by all the Hindu schools of thought. There are various schools of advaita - Suddhadvaita,

---

1. Pattuppāṭṭu; pp. 79, 128, 178, 262, 287, 433, 465, 512, 563, 663.
2. Pattuppāṭṭu; pp. IX, IXI.
3. Kali; vv. 101 : 8, 103:15, Jīvaka; v. 1488.
4. Naccinārkkiniyar; pp. 6-8.

Kēvalādvita etc. It cannot be said that even all kēvalādvitas are Siva worshippers. But Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar was certainly a worshipper of Siva.

1.2.2. *The religious tolerance of Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar*

The religious tolerance of Naccin̲arkkin̲yar is really admirable. The very fact that one of his commantaries is on a Jain work shows his broad outlook. Also so fully does he identify himself with the work that it looks as though he agrees with the Jain poet in the view that "music and dance induce passion".[1] His references to certain Jain beliefs in his commentary prove his erudite scholarship and appreciation of things not belonging to his own religion.[2] "For the Tolkāppiyam sūtram 'aruḷoṭu puṇarnta akar̲ci', he gives the meaning 'renunciation' and says it is like the renunciation of Buddha and quotes Buddha Jātaka stories"[3]. These things show not mere religious tolerance but keen admiration of sister religions.

1.2.3. *The period af Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar*

Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar refers at certain places to the commentaries by Pērāciriyar, Cēn̲āvaraiyar and Iḷampūraṇar[4] and thus he belongs to a period later than theirs. Cēn̲āvaraiyar flourished in the 13th and 14th centuries, during the reign of Mār̲avarman̲ Kulasēkara Paṇḍiyan̲.[5] So Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar's period must be some time after the 14th century A.D.[6]

1.3. *The works of Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar*

Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar was well-versed both in grammar and literature. From a verse eulogising his commentary, it is clear that he wrote commentaries on the following works :-[7]

1. Tolkāppiyam
2. Pattuppāṭṭu.
3. Kalittokai.
4. Kur̲untokai. (20 verses only)
5. Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi

The fact that he wrote commentaries only on 20 verses in Kur̲untokai is evident from the line

"ārakkur̲untokaiyuḷ ainnān̲kum"[8]

---

1. Jīvaka; vv. 2597, 2598, 2718.
2. Infra; pp. 19-20
3. Naccin̲ārkkin̲yar; pp. 8-9.
4. Tol. Eḷuttu; ss. 10, 27, 50, etc. Tol. Col; ss. 1, 25, 35, etc.
5. Cācan̲attamiḷkkavi caritam; p. 113. Ilakkiyavarālār̲u; p. 36.
6. A history of Tamil Literature; p. 216.
7. Pattuppāṭṭu; p. lix.
8. Ibid, p. lviii.

All his commentaries, except the one on Kuṟuntokai, have been published. We do not have the whole of his commentary on Tolkāppiyam. We have only his commentaries on Eḻuttu, Col and six chapters in Poruḷ. The last chapter in Tolkāppiyam is 'Marapiyal'. Naccinārkkiniyar refers elsewhere to his commentary on 'Marapiyal' and this shows that his commentary was on the whole work.[1]

1.3.1. *Has Naccinārkkiniyar written a commentary on Tirukkōvaiyar?*

Some scholars hold that Naccinārkkiniyar has written a commentary on Tirukkōvaiyār. He gives quotations from Tirukkōvaiyār in his commentary on Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi.[2] But he does not refer to any commentary of his on that work, as he does, to his commentary on Tolkāppiyam. Also the verses that eulogise his commentaries do not mention his commentary on Tirukkōvaiyār.[3] The commentary now available on Tirukkōvaiyār has been proved to be by Pērāciriyar.[4]

1.3.2. *His earliest commentary : that on Tolkāppiyam*

It is very difficult to find out the chronological order of these commentaries. But it can be fairly surmised that his commentary on Tolkāppiyam was the earliest among his commentaries. It is evident from his own commentaries, since he quotes his commentary on Tolkāppiyam in his commentaries on other works.[5]

1.3.3. *The commentary on Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi*

In his commentary on Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi, Naccinārkkiniyar quotes his own commentary on Tolkāppiyam.[6] But occasionally in his commentary on Tolkāppiyam he quotes his commentary on Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi.[7] Our earlier conclusion is therefore disturbed. But Dr. U. V. Swaminatha Iyer has suggested an explanation of this

---

1. Porunar; 11. 139, 143, 159.,
   Perumpān; 1. 183.
   Jīvaka; v. 2690.
2. Jīvaka; vv, 31, 50, 148, 1487, 1749, 1791, 2476.
3. Pattuppāṭṭu; pp. Iviii-Ix.
4. Jīvaka; p. 28.
5. Porunar; 1. 139, 143, 159.,
   Ciṟupāṉ; 11. 11, 28-30, 143.,
   Perumpāṇ; 1.183., Maturai; 11.468, 725-726, 764-765.
   Kali; vv. 1:1., 6:8-11, 23:8-13, 32:16-17, 39:44, 60:23, 67:5, 88:11-14, 93: 29-36, 96:22:31, 96:32-39; 109:21-26, 114:13-14, 119, 127:7
   Jīvaka; 72, 892-893, 1913, 2690.
6. Jīvaka; 72, 892-893, 1913, 2690.
7. Tol. Ceyyuḷiyal; ss. 210, 211, 238.

anomaly. The story has it that Naccinārkkiniyar wrote a commentary on Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi and showed it to the Jain scholars for approval. But they rejected it on the ground that it did not conform to their understanding of their religion. And Naccinārkkiniyar wrote another commentary which was accepted by the Jains. Dr. U. V. Swaminatha Iyer suggests that the statements found in the Tolkāppiyam commentary referring to his commentary on Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi, must have actually related to his earlier commentary on the epic.[1] To some extent this solves the problem, but not fully.

1.3.4. *The commentaries on Pattuppāṭṭu and Kalittokai*

It is also impossible to fix the chronological order of his commentaries on Pattuppāṭṭu and Kalittokai. There are indications here and there, but one can not reach a definite conclusion. Naccinārkkiniyar quotes Pattuppāṭṭu in his commentary on Kalittokai.

> " Akan ñālam viḷakkum tan pal katir vāyāka-p-
> Pakal nuṅkiyatu pōla-p-paṭu cuṭar kal cēra ".[2]

Here the sun-set is described. It means that the sun, with the rays as his mouth, swallows the day and sets in the west. But Naccinārkkiniyar adds " what he spat earlier, the day "—. The addition is Naccinārkkiniyar's own, and for this he quotes from Perumpāṇāṟṟuppaṭai.

> " Pakal kānṟu ēḷutarum pal katir-p-paruti ".[3]

Here he quotes Pattuppāṭṭu in his commentary on Kalittokai, but does not quote this Kalittokai passage while commenting on Perumpāṇāṟṟuppaṭai.

There is however a quotation from another part of Kallittokai in his commentary on Pattuppāṭṭu. " Panikkum Pācaṟai ".[4] It is like ' nōy tīru maruntu '.[5] Naccinārkkiniyar had in his mind the full view of all the literary works he had read and hence it is difficult to determine the chronological order of his commentaries.

1.3.5. *The commentaries on Pattuppāṭṭu and Jivaka Cintāmaṇi*

There are many places where he quotes Pattuppāṭṭu in his commentary on Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi. But half of them relate to

1. Jīvaka; p. 29 Pattuppāṭṭu; p. Ixii.
2. Kali; v. 119: 1-2.
3. Perumpāṇ; 1.2.
4. Mullai; 1. 79.
5. Kali; v. 60:18.

similarity of ideas only.[1] There are places where he quotes from Pattuppāṭṭu in his commentary on Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi, relating to the special meaning of certain words that attain significance theory.

Ōṭutal	—	to destroy.[2]
Puḷ	—	bangles.[3]
Matalai	—	support.[4]
Maṉṉu	—	to make.[5]
Akam	—	agricultural tract.[6]
Tēmputal	—	suffering.[7]
Māytal	—	vanish.[8]

Though Naccinārkkiṉiyar thus quotes from Pattuppāṭṭu in his commentary on Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi to justify his stand, he does not quote from Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi in his commentary on Pattuppāṭṭu. Perhaps it may be argued that, since Pattuppāṭṭu precedes Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi in age, he might have done so. But this is not decisive.

'Nālku' is a corruption of the word 'nāṉku' meaning four. This word occurs both in Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi and Pattuppāṭṭu, but Naccinārkkiṉiyar quotes from Pattuppāṭṭu while writing the commentary on Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi.[9] The word 'tam' occurs with the meaning 'tārum' (give) and in his commentary on Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi he quotes such an occurrence from Pattuppāṭṭu.[10] The word 'niḻal' (shade), a noun is used as a verb in the form of 'niḻaṉṟu' (to offer shade) and this is used both in Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi and Pattuppāṭṭu.[11] Naccinārkkiṉiyar quotes only Pattuppāṭṭu in his commentary on Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi and not vice-versa.

It is true there are places where he quotes Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi in his commentary on Pattuppāṭṭu, but it is only to emphasise and elucidate the similarity of ideas. He does not quote Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi from the point of view of syntax or meaning in his commentary on Pattupāṭṭu.

1. Jīvaka; vv. 31, 51, 275, 559, 698, 882, 1158, 1416, 1462, 1713, 1996, 2328.
2. Jīvaka; 2382, Ciṟupāṇ; l. 214.
3. Ibid; v. 2591, Malai; l. 253.
4. Ibid; v. 1895, Perumpāṇ; l. 346.
5. Ibid; vv. 735, 1808, Maturai, l. 494.
6. Ibid; v. 1613 Maturai; l.149.
7. Ibid; v. 232, Paṭṭiṉam; l.4.
8. Ibid; v. 453, Maturai; l. 247.
9. Jīvaka; v. 1774., Porunar; l. 165.
10. Ibid; v. 906., Maturai; l. 731.
11. Ibid; v. 1270., Ciṟupāṇ; l. 233.

To sing like playing on Vīṇai.[1]
Nectar-like voice.[2]
To fight according to the priority of heroism.[3]

There are also other places where he quotes not only from Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi in his commentary on Pattuppāṭṭu, and also from Pattuppāṭṭu in his commentary on Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi for the sole purpose of emphasising similar ideas.[4] That there are 'three lines in the chest of Muruka' has been quoted in his commentary on Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi whilst the same lines from Jīvaka Cintāmani are quoted in his commentary on Pattuppāṭṭu.[5] All this makes it difficult to decide the chronological order of his commentaries on Pattuppāṭṭu and Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi.

But we saw earlier what Dr. U.N. Swaminatha Iyer has stated in his biographical sketch of Naccinārkkiniyar that Naccinarkkiniyar wrote two commentaries on Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi.[6] If it is so, we can consider that the quotation in Pattuppāṭṭu from Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi perhaps pertains to his earlier commentary on that great epic. After its rejection he might have written his commentary on Pattuppāṭṭu, and from his later experience and deeper study, he might have written the comentary on Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi which is available now and hence his detailed references therein to morphology and special meanings of words.

1.3.6. *The commentaries on Kalittokai and Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi*

Naccinārkkiniyar quotes from Kalittokai in his commentary on Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi for elucidating points relating to (1) the meanings, (2) the forms and (3) other grammatical significance of words. Some of them are :

1. *Meanings of words*

Kalai — sugarcane.[7]
Ambi — to forsake.[8]
Yāmam — night.[9]

---

1. Jīvaka; v. 658; Maturai; 1.217.
2. Ibid; v. 722, Cirupāṇ 1. 226.
3. Ibid; v. 2265, Maturai, 11. 53-54.
4. Jivaka ; v. 2265, Cirupān; 1.232.
   Ibid; v. 189., Neṭu; 11.131-133.
   Ibid; v. 2473, Maturai; 11.400-401.
   Ibid; v. 285., Ibid; 1. 598.
5. Ibid; 1462., Muruku; 1. 104.
6. Supra; p.6., 1.3.3.
7. Jīvaka; v, 1064., Kali v.40:28
8. Ibid; v. 982., Ibid; v.82:35
9. Ibid v. 135., Ibid; v.139:14

2. *Forms of words*

'Kaṇṇīrkal' occuring in Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi is like 'pāl cila' in Kalittokai.[1]

"Vaḷarntatai" a verbal form occurring in Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi is like 'uraittatai' in Kalittokai.[2]

3. *Grammatical Significance*

"Nūṟṟulām maṇṭapam". 'Nūṟu' meaning 'hundred', here stands as āku peyar, in the sense of a hundred feet. This is like 'āru' meaning six standing as 'āku peyar' to denote the six divisions of vedas.[3]

This evidence suggests that his commentary on Kalittokai was earlier than his commentary on Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi.

Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi has not been quoted to this extent in the commentary on Kalittokai. But in one place where he changes the order of words in his own manner, he justifies it by quoting Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi.[4] The lines in Kalittokai can be directly interpreted to mean that the impresssion left by the crab on the sandy shore are similar to the impression left by the dice on the gambling ground.[5] But Naccinarkkiniyar states that the crabs with stripes look like the dice that leave impression on the gambling ground. In this connection he quotes Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi "the dice rolled like the moving crab".

Because he has quoted Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi in Kalittokai it cannot be held that the Cintāmaṇi commentary is earlier than his commentary on Kalittokai. To bring out a far-fetched meaning in Kalittokai, he has quoted a line from Cintāmaṇi, which directly means the the same thing as he wants to attribute to the passage in Kalittokai. It means perhaps he has in mind what he has read in Cintāmaṇi at the time he wrote his commentary on Kalittokai, but it must be remembered that he does not quote in Kalittokai, any of his 'favourite ingenious interpretations' from Cintāmaṇi, but only a passage that directly refers to the meaning which he attributes to the lines in Kalittokai when he indulges in such ingenuity.

---

1. Jīvaka; v.2087., Kali; v.76;32-33.
2. Ibid; v.223., Ibid; v.76:9.
3. Jīvaka; v.2734., Kali; v.1:1.
4. Ibid; v. 927.
5. Kali; v.136: 1-4.

1.4. *Naccinārkkiniyar's Scholarship in Sanskrit*

In addition to his vast scholarship in Tamil language and literature, Naccinārkkiniyar has profound scholarship in Sanskrit. He brings this to bear upon the commentaries he wrote on the grammatical and literary works in Tamil. He makes use of his Sanskrit scholarship to indicate the derivations of Tamil words, to explain the Tamil words and phrases and to compare Tamil traditions with Sanskrit traditions.

1.4.1 *Sanskrit derivations*

The words of Sanskrit, as they are used in Tamil, undergo a change and Naccinārkkiniyar explains them wherever necessary. Some of them are :-

Derivations in Tamil	*Sanskrit words*
Tampalam.	Tāmpūlam[1]
Cācaran.	Sahasrāran.[2]
Cēṇikan.	Srēṇikan.[3]
Uvā.	Yuvā[4]

Naccinārkkiniyar also holds that some of the fancied Sanskritic corruptions in Tamil are not so, but are genuine Tamil words, for example :

"Viyamamē vāḻi kutirai"[5]

Here some scholars consider that 'viyamam' is an altered form of the Sanskrit word 'viṣamam'. But, 'viṣamam' can become in Tamil only 'viṭamam' and not 'viyamam'. So Naccinārkkiniyar argues that it is not a Sanskrit word but a Tamil word where the root is 'viya'— 'to wonder' and this 'viyamam' is another form of 'viyappu' in Tamil.

1.4.2. *Sanskritic explanations*

Naccinārkkiniyar uses the Sanskrit words in his explanation of certain Tamil words.

Tamil words		*Sanskrit explanations*
Kavin	—	Samudāya sōbai.[6]
Verukkai	—	Pākuṭam[7]

1. Kali; v. 65:13.
2. Jīvaka; v. 2889.
3. Ibid; v. 3044.
4. Kali v. 97:25.
5. Ibid; v. 96: 31.
6. Jīvaka; v. 1357.
7. Ibid; v. 2708.

Mukil vītal	—	Mēka vin̲ācam.[1]
Kaṇṇaṉār	—	Upatiruṣṭā.[2]
Kaṭikai	—	Mahūrtta vitaṉi[3]
Kāṉattiṉēkukiṉṟāṉ.	—	Vaṉa caritaṉ.[4]

Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar explains certain Tamil ideas in the light of Sanskritic thought. 'Tavir veyya kāmam'—This is like 'vītarākar'.[5] He also classifies women into three categories as, (1) women in whom the feeling of sex is absent. (2) women in whom the feeling of sex is just sprouting and (3) women in whom the feeling of sex is well developed.[6] This classification of women seems to follow Sanskrit model.[7] He interprets the phrase 'perumaṇa-k-kiḻamai' (the right for marriage) as "camāvarttaṉam".[8] When he interprets the five kinds of war in Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi he calls it 'pañca kiruttiyam' as it is in Sanskrit.[9]

1.4.3 *Forced interpretations*

He also gives forced interpretations to certain Tamil words so as to make them equivalents of Sanskrit terms.

Tamil words		*Forced interpretations*
Tiru	—	Vīra sri.[10]
Tēṉ ūta.	—	Tēṉiṉam cattikka.[11]
Pukar paṭa	—	Kāma taṉmam kuṟṟappaṭa.[12]
Ciṟiya ayiṉṟār	—	aṟpākarikaḷ.[13]
Mai	—	Maṣi.[14]
Cēṟu.	—	puṭpatūḷi.[15]

It is difficult to understand why Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar uses these Sanskrit words while he usually writes in lucid and sweet Tamil. Perhaps, they are later additions interpolated in his commentary.

1. Ibid; v. 2833.
2. Ibid; v. 2362.
3. Ibid;
4. Jīvaka; v. 1567.
5. Ibid; v. 2542.
6. Ibid; p. 2529.
7. Ibid; p. 1248. Foot notes.
8. Ibid; v. 822-823.
9. Ibid; v. 1676.
10. Jīvaka; v. 771.
11. Kali; v. 36:6.
12. Ibid; v. 12:16-17.
13. Jīvaka; v. 2033.
14. Ibid; v. 1767.
15. Jīvaka; v. 2019.

1.4.4. *Sanskritic traditions*

In Tolkāppiyam Eḻuttatikāram commentary, Naccinārkkiniyar holds that the author follows only the Tamil tradition in the use of the language and interprets the sūtrams in the same manner.[1] Tolkāppiyar has classified all those letters that occur initially in words and Naccinārkkiniyar gives examples of Tamil words only for this, and refuses Sanskit words, slang etc.[2] Tolkāppiyar's classification of mono-syllabic words, two syllabic words, and multi-syllabic words, according to Naccinārkkiniyar, does not follow the Sanskit pattern, but the Tamil usage oṉṟu, cila and pala (one, some and many).[3] Thus Naccinārkkiniyar establishes that Tolkāppiyar follows only the Tamil tradition.

In Tolkāppiyam-Collatikāram also, Naccinārkkiniyar interprets Tolkāppiyam, following the Tamil tradition, where he refers to the relationship of words in sequence in a sentence : payanilai, Tokainilai and eṇṇunilai. But he also mentions the Sanskrit theories i.e. avāynilai, aṇmai and takuti.[4] In Collatikāram, his interpretation thus introduces to some extent the Sanskritic line of thinking, perhaps following Cēnāvaraiyar's analysis which refers to the common aspects of language in general.

In Tolkāppiyam—Poruḷatikāram, there are many places where Naccinārkkiniyar departs from his own assertion that Tolkāppiyar follows the Tamil tradition. Some of them are :—

1. "Here 'enpa' does not refer to the original Tamil authors but the Sanskrit authors".[5]

2. "The hero is well-versed in Vedās and Dharma Sāstrās. When Brahmins, Kshatriyas and Vaisayas perform yagnas' they give preference only to such of their many wives who belong to their respective caste".[6]

3. "The marriage ceremony is celebrated by the chanting of mantras and performance of Vēdic rites".[7]

---

1. Tol. Eḻuttu; pp. 12-13.
2. Ibid; ss. 62, 64, 65, 75.
3. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 45.
4. Tol. Col; s. 1, pp. 3-4.
5. Tol Poruḷ; s. 145, p. 545.
6. Ibid; s. 147: 1-2, pp. 577-579.
7. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 150.p.612-613.

There are also other such references in Tolkāppiyam Poruḷatikāram commentary[1]. In some places, Naccinārkkiniyar introduces Sanskrit ideas too freely.[2] Perhaps these are due to the age in which he lived, when people in Tamil land believed that all the rituals and practices of their own age went back to very early times to the age of Tolkāppiyar. This is what happens when one tries to interpret earlier works according to the conditions one knows. It requires a historical perspective, as in the modern age, to get rid of this pitfall in interpretting older texts. Anyhow all the examples mentioned above show the great scholarship of Naccinārkkiniyar in Sanskrit.

1.5. *Naccinārkkiniyar's Knowledge in other Fields*

Naccinārkkiniyar displays also knowledge of political, social and religious history. To explain the religious faiths he quotes from Vēdās, Ākamās, Purāṇās and other Sāstrās He is familiar with the traditional knowledge of natural and physical sciences.

1.5.1. *Political knowledge*

Naccinārkkiniyar faithfully follows legends and tradition and records certain points of apparent political significance. He does not discriminate between fact and fiction, but that some of his statements contain history, cannot be denied. He mentions some princely families as "aim peruvēḷir and Paratavar.[3] He establishes that the latter ruled over the southern region of Tamilnad, by quoting from Puranāṉūṟu.[4] According to him Neṭiyōṉ is another name for Vaṭimpalampa niṉṟa Pāṇḍiyaṉ, and the later king, the hero of Maturaikkāñci, belonged to his dynasty.[5] He identifies Māṟaṉ as a chieftain in the Pāṇḍyā kingdom who belonged to the family of the hero of Maturaikkāñci.[6] It must be conceded that Naccinārkkiniyar is able to a fair extent to relate history and literature.

According to Naccinārkkiniyar, Karikālaṉ did not succeed to the kingship by virtue of his birth, but acquired it by conquest as a youth and this helps to reconcile the anomalies in the conflicting versions of the history of Tirumāvaḷavaṉ in Paṭṭiṉappālai and Karikālaṉ in Porunarāṟṟuppaṭai, as in the opinion of Naccinārkkiniyar Tirumāvaḷavaṉ is Karikālaṉ.[7] But there is also a view that the hero of Paṭṭiṉappālai is not the same Karikālaṉ mentioned in Porunarāṟṟ-

1. Ibid; ss. 172, 188, 192, 217, etc.
2. Ibid; s.146:10-11, p. 553.
3. Paṭṭiṉam; 1. 282, Maturai; 11. 128-129.
4. Maturai; 1.144. Puṟam; v. 378: 1-2.
5. Ibid; 1. 61.
6. Ibid; 11. 771-772.
7. Porunar; 11. 137-140.

uppaṭai.[1] There is a popular legend that Karikālaṉ, to dispel the doubts of two elders whether he could deliver the right judgement over some dispute between them, dressed himself up as an old man and gave his verdict — that satisfied them both. Naccinārkkiṉiyar, bearing in mind this legend, interprets a line in Pattuppāṭṭu as referring to that incident.[2] His interpretation seems to be a little far-fetched at this place, but it cannot be denied that Naccinārkkiṉiyar weaves history, legends, proverbs etc., into a coherent whole to give continuity to the narrative.

Naccinārkkiṉiyar is carried away by the sheer romantic possibilities of the popular legends current during his period and he records them with a relish as if they are facts of history. The origin of the name 'Vēlūr' (that flowers became javelins by the grace of Lord Muruka),[3] the story of Toṇṭaimāṉ Iḷantiraiyaṉ's birth (Tiraiyaṉ, one nursed by the waves of the sea as he was laid bound by a toṇṭai creeper in the high seas by the Nāgā maiden who married a Cōlā king)[4] etc.

1.5.2. *Knowledge of society*

We understand from Naccinārkiṉiyar the type of society that should have existed during his period. There were four castes, Brahmins, Kshatriyas, Vaisyas and Veḷḷāḷas. There were other castes arising from the mingling of these main four. Naccinārkkiṉiyar explaining the pharse 'kuṭiccelvar' refers to the four main groups of 'Piṟar' (others) as indicating the other castes that originated from them.[5] The Brahmins could marry from all the four castes, Kshatriyas from the other three save the Brahmans, the Vaisyas from the two excepting the Brahmins and Kshatriyas.[6] A man belonging to the lower caste could not marry a woman belonging to the higher caste.[7]

There were several sub—castes in the Vaisya group, as Vēdavāṇikar, Ippar, Kavippar, Peruṅkuṭiyar, etc.[8] Titles with special ornaments were presented by the kings to the merchant community in accordance with their rank in the social hierarchy.[9] There were two

---

1. Karikālar mūvar, pp. 77-81.
2. Porunar; ll. 187-188.
3. Ciṟupāṉ; ll. 172-173.
4. Perumpāṉ; ll. 29-37.
5. Maturai; ll. 577-578.
6. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 75, p. 247.
7. Jīvaka; v. 742.
8. Paṭṭinam; ll. 205-207., Jīvaka; v. 1756.
9. Jīvaka; v. 112.

main sub divisions in the Veḷḷāḷa group namely Uḻutuṉpōr (Veḷḷāḷas who themselves cultivate the land) and Uḻuvittuṉpōr (Veḷḷāḷas who are the owners of the land but who cause it to be cultivated by others) according to Naccinārkkiṉiyar.[1] Kalittokai refers to three groups in the the Āyar community (the people in the forest region) as Kōṭṭiṉattāyar, Kōviṉattāyar and Pulliṉattāyar. According to Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar these were different sub classes who looked after the buffalos, cows and sheep, respectively.[2] Also he refers to a kind of community that determined the capacity of milk production of cows, which shows that castes sprang up with reference to the ablity of the cowherds too.[3]

There were certain habits prevalent in these days which the commentator refers to in his work. The people who swear, do so by touching the body of the ladies.[4] The women blessed others to live up to a hundred.[5] The mothers used to put up the lamps to safeguard their children.[6] A person was introduced to women as the son of such and such a woman, and without any reference to his father.[7] The women who some time after child-birth never wore bangles.[8] The mothers sent their children to welcome guests calling them as their uncles or brothers.[9] The guests were entertained with milk and rice kept for the hosts in case there was no time to cook fresh meals for the guests.[10] The hosts walk seven feet following the musicians, when they bid farewell to them.[11] There are also many other references to the dress, ornaments etc., in the commentary of Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar all of which are very useful to understand the cultural history of the people in those days.

1.5.3 *Religious knowledge*

Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar had to acquent himself with all the different schools of religious thought as he wrote commentaries on works belonging to different religions. Tirumurukāṟṟuppaṭai is a Saivite work and Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi propagates the teachings of Jainism.

---

1. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 29, p. 78-79.
2. Kali; v. 103: 33-47.
3. Ibid; v. 107:2.
4. Jīvaka; v. 2045.
5. Jīvaka; v. 2043.
6. Ibid; v. 1367.
7. Ibid; vv. 1789-1792.
8. Malai; l. 253.
9. Malai; l. 185.
10. Ibid; l. 417.
11. Porunar; 1-166.

Naccinārkkiniyar, although he belonged to the Saiva cult, has done full justice to Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi in annotating the Jain thoughts underlying that work.

Naccinārkkiniyar's knowledge in Saivism is seen in his works. He explains some of the passages in Tirumurukārruppaṭai with reference from Tiruvācakam. One of the six faces of Lord Muruka enjoys the company of Valli and this is explained by Naccinārkkiniyar referring to a portion in Tiruvācakam where Lord Siva, even though he has no human feeling or passion, is in the company of Pārvati, to set an example for the world to follow.[1] The line "Pulam pirintu uraiyum aṭi" occurring in Tirumurukārruppaṭai is also explained by a reference in Tiruvācakam that the feet of the Lord mean Mōksha.[2] The figure of Lord Muruka with one hand on his chest and another on the garland adorning the chest is explained by the commentator as referring to Mōna muttirai full of Eternal Bliss.[3] Perhaps among the four stages explained in religious experience as cālōkam, cāmīpam, cārūpam and cāyucciyam he is referring here to 'cārūpam'. Naccinārkkiniyar also quotes extensively the Purāṇic stories in Tirumurukārruppaṭai which shows how he is steeped in religious tradition.[4]

Naccinārkkiniyar has profound scholarship in various religious works. A statement of Naccinārkkiniyar—"as they are mentioned in religious works...they may be realised as Gods", shows his erudition in various religious works.[5] The nature of the three worlds is well explained by the ākamas namely 'Aṅgam', Pūrvam and Āti according to Naccinārkkiniyar.[6] He annotates many Jain ideas with the help of Paramākamam, one of the greatest Jain works. Pāṇimukam is one of the destinations of life, according to Paramākamam as explained by the commentator.[7] He says that in olden days there were other Vēdas preceding the four now known as Rig, Yajur, Cāmam and Atharvaṇam. Those Vēdas according to him belonged to Jainism and they never prescribed Himsa (viloence).[8] Perhaps he considered that the present four Vēdas Rig etc. as classified by Vyāsa, belonged to a later date than Tolkāppiyam, but the

1. Muruku; 11. 100-102.
   Tiruvācakam. Tiruccāḷal; v. 9.
2. Muruku; 11.62-63.,
   Tiruvacakam. Tiruvammānai; v.6.
3. Muruku; 11.111-113.
4. Muruku; 11.58, 163-165, 253-255.
5. Jīvaka; v. 1045.
6. Ibid; v. 1246.
7. Ibid; v. 948.
8. Ibid; v. 1242.

original four Vēdās according to him were Taittiriyam, pauṭikam, Talavakāram and Cāma Vēdam.[1]

His knowledge of Jainism is really profound. He mentions and explains the Ratnatrayam or the three Jems—Right Faith, Right Knowledge and Right Conduct which sum up the tenets of Jain cult,[2] the four Katis, the stages of existence, through which the soul may pass namely—Dēva Kati, Makkaḷ Kati, Vilaṅku Kati and Naraka Kati,[3] the Āṉma which is interested in Mukti, namely Bavyajīvaṉ,[4] the four Caraṇams known as Aruka caraṇam, citta caraṇam, cātu caraṇam and Taṉma Caraṇam,[5] various ñāṉams such as Curuta ñāṉam, Avatiñāṉam, etc.[6] Mantrams like Pañca namaskāram, Kāmiṉi, Matimukam, Kāṇṭa Mantiram, etc.[7] Jaina temples like Araṇapātam, Camava Caraṇam, etc.[8] various natures, of God such as the possession of 'Ananta Vīriyam', the possession of 'Cukkila-t-tiyāṉam', becoming great by the eight qualities, free from the eight Kaṉmas[9] and many other philosophical aspects of Jainism—are explained by Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar.

1.5.4. *Knowledge of natural and Physical sciences*

Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar classifies many kinds of plants, flowers, etc. and refers to their particular species.[10] He says that the moonlight encourages the growth of food contents in the crops.[11] Sun light reaches places where moonlight cannot go.[12] That the earth is constituted of atoms,[13] that several planets exist,[14] that the soil came after the rock,[15] that the four elements have their origin in the sky,[16] etc.,—all this is mentioned by Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar. He gives the indications of pregnancy and describes the growth of the foetus

1. Tol. Eḻuttu; p.11
2. Jīvaka; vv. 374.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid; vv. 374-382.
6. Jīvakā; vv.951, 3038, 3039.
7. Ibid; 273, 793, 933, 1289, 1459, 1708, 1713.
8. Jīvaka; vv. 1177, 3000.
9. Ibid; vv. 2562, 2600
10. Muruku; 11-190, 236, 190, 236, 192, Malai; 11.219, 133, 121, Porunar; 11.190-200, 234, Maturai; 1.172, Kuṟiñci; 11. 61-95, etc.
11. Kali; v. 31:11,
12. Ibid; v.144: 39-42.
13. Jīvaka; v.345.
14. Ibid; v. 3003.
15. Maturai; 11.3-4.
16. Perumpāṉ; L.I.

inside the womb of the mother.[1] He also mentions the names of some animals,[2] refers to kinds of bees,[3] the nature of the snake's poisonous teeth[4] and so on. But it is the traditional knowledge of his times that he makes use of in interpreting these texts which were equally products of such traditional knowledge. It may be that the texts may reveal some truths to modern scientists if they were read freed from the trammals of this kind of tradition.

1.6. *The Works on Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar*

No single book covering all the works of Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar and assessing their merits has appeared so far. But some scholars have estimated some of the aspects of his works here and there, and they are of very great help to a student of Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar.

1.6.1. *Dr. U.V.S. Iyer's references*

The pioneer of modern Tamil scholars, 'whose name shall last as long as the language lasts' (in the words of Bhārathi),[5] Dr. U. V. Swaminatha Iyer has given a brief history of Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar and his works, in all the works of this commentator which he has edited. He has given some of the salient points of Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar's commentary. "Giving the significance of the words in poems, quotations from some of the early works in prose order, quotations from Vedas and related works, quotations from other literary works sometimes without mentioning the authors, subtle explanations of the context of the various events, interpretations generally conforming to the ideas of the author of the poem or epic"—are some of the aspects he has mentioned as the general characteristics of Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar's commentary,[6] They are of immense help to a research student.

1.6.2. *S. S. W. P. Society's 'Lecture compilations'*

The Saiva Siddānta Works Publishing Society has brought out two books, Lectures on Pattuppāṭṭu and Kalittokai respectively and they are valuable as they introduce these great Sangam works to the public. General Statements regarding Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar's syntax are

---

1. Jīvaka; vv. 231, 305, 2754-2760.
2. Malai; 141, 292, Kur̲iñci; 1.257.
   Muruku; 302-303. Jīvaka; vv. 1250, 1893 etc.
3. Jīvaka; 897, Perumpāṇ; 1.183.
4. Muruku; 1.148.
5. Bhārathiyār kavitaikal. p.
6. Pattuppāṭṭu; pp. Ixi-Ixii.,
   Jīvaka, p. 28-33.

found in the books,[1] but a real assessment of his work is not traceable except at certain places.[2]

1.6.3. *Other research studies*

Professor Avvai Doraiswamy Pillai has written a book "Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi ārāycci" which is one of the best critical works of recent times. But the author has devoted more attention to the epic than to the commentary of Naccinārkkiniyar. Though the book is useful for a study of the epic, it is not equally helpful for study of its great commentator. But his brief chapter dealing with certain points regarding the characteristic features of Naccinārkkiniyar is of great help to a student of Naccinārkkiniyar with reference to Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi.[3] There are some good research studies of some of the works in Pattuppāṭṭu such as Maraimalai Aṭikaḷ's "Mullai-p-pāṭṭu ārāycci urai" and "Paṭṭinappālai ārāycci urai". But the author has made it clear, even at outset, that he has written those books only to show the great Saṅgam works in their proper light, and to remove the confusion which Naccinārkkiniyar has caused by the manner of his interpretation.[4] Professor T. P. Meenakshisundaranar has written critical essays on some of the idylls in Pattuppāṭṭu, especially on Tirumurukārruppaṭai and Mullai—p—pāṭṭu. He has, in his critical study of those works, assessed the merits of Naccinārkkiniyiar in many places. They are of immense help for a student of the great commentator. The book "Perumpāṇārrup-paṭai ārāycciyum uraiyum" of Mahāvidvān R. Raghava Iyengar is a good work but more helpful to a student of history than to a student of literature.

1.6.4. *Criticism*

Professor Ilakkuvanār in his "Tolkāppiya ārāycci" has assessed the merits of Naccinārkkiniyar with reference to Tolkāppiyam commentary.[5] Dr. V.S.P. Māṇikkam in his thesis, "The Tamil concept of love", has raised some points for discussion regarding the views of Naccinārkkiniyar.[6] Dr. Somasundara Bhārathiyār and Dr. P. S. Subramaniya Sastriyar have written new commentaries on Tolkāppiyam and they are helpful for a study of Naccinārkkiniyar to the extent of their critcism. Professor Iḷavaḷakanār has given a short note

1. Pattuppāṭṭu-c-corpoḷivukaḷ; pp. 63, 81-82, 126, etc.
2. Pattuppāṭṭu-c-corpoḷivukaḷ; pp. 3, 34, 37, 42, 153-154, 158, 210, 286, etc. Kalittokai-c-corpoḷivukaḷ; pp. 7,9, 16-17, 42, 45, 53, 83, etc.
3. Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi ārāycci; pp. 225-237.
4. Mullai-p-pāṭṭu ārāycciyurai; Introduction; pp. 13-14, 18-19.
5. Tolkāppiya ārāycci; pp. 99, 144, 146, 157-158, 161-163, 176, 181-186, 194-195, etc.
6. The Tamil Concept of Love; pp. 71-72, 140, 267-269 etc.

on Naccinārkkiniyar to explain his commentary, in the edition of Kalittokai, and it is useful with reference to that work. He has critically investigated the commentary of Naccinārkkiniyar and assessed his merits to a great extent. Mr. M. Aṇṇāmalai has written a book recently "Naccinārkkiniyar". He has taken for consideration mainly Naccinārkkiniyar's commentary on Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi. As the work is intended for the common man, he limits himself only to a few remarks that may appeal to a popular audience. It is a good work in as much as the author tries to remove the natural prejudices of modern Tamil scholars against Naccinārkkiniyar.[1] The present thesis is indebted to all the works mentioned above and to a number of essays on Cintāmaṇi which has been published in various journals of Tamil Nad.

1.7. *The main approach and Contribution of the thesis*

Naccinārkkiniyar is a great critic. He is steeped in the traditions of Tamil grammar, literature and culture. He has critically studied all the earlier major works in Tamil and this thesis is engaged in studying critically his commentaries. Walter Peter lays down three functions for a critic :[2]

1. To feel the virtue of the poet.
2. To disengage it.
3. To set it forth.

This thesis tries to perform these functions by seeking to realise certain important features of Naccinārkkiniyar's commentary, disengage them under various headings and to set them forth with their individual beauty and merit.

1.7.1. *Inductive criticism followed*

There are two main kinds of criticism—(1) inductive and (2) judicial. Judicial criticism stands in judgment of things, but inductive criticism engages itself in an analysis of what already exists, and is more derivative in purpose than arrogating authority to pronounce judgment. "An inductive critic analyses only the works of the poet. He finds the general aspects of them all from various angles. He formulates certain rules and regulations to appreciate the poet derived from a close study of his works. It must be emphasised once again that the methods of appreciation are derived from within and not from without. The external yardstick is invalid with reference to inductive criticism".[3]

1. Naccinārkkiniyar; pp. 18-19, 21, 42-43, 49-51, etc.
2. Introduction to the study of Literature; p. 268.
3. Ilakkiyakkalai; pp. 43-49.

1.7.2. *Partly judicial criticism*

This thesis follows mainly the methods of inductive criticism rather than those of judicial criticism. There are however, a few places where one cannot but pronounce one's own literary or gramatical judgment. There are some instances where Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar's interpretations may be different from the literal interpretation of the poet's idea. At such places it is impossible to avoid judgment about the appropriateness or otherwise of Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar's interpretation.

1.7.3. *Some of the important original contributions of the thesis*

This thesis consists of three parts: (1) Literature, (2) Grammar, (3) Linguistics. The first part concerns itself with a study a Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar's methods of literary appreciation, his appreciation of similes and metaphors and his interpretation of synonymy and polysemy. The second part confines itself to an analysis of Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar's scholarship in grammar. The methodology of Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar's grammatical criticism is explained and this attempt is made for the first time in a systematic manner only here. The third and the last part deals with his views on phonology, morphology, and syntax and semantics, and a comparison of the same with the modern opinions of the linguistic scholars, are dealt with in this part.

(1) In poetry, where it is possible to interpret lines in a literal manner without any strain, Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar interprets in a manner that comes for criticism by modern scholars. Such places have been critically investigated and it has been pointed out that he does so for some good reason. His abundant confidence in literary tradition and his magic touch which, creating a beauty out of recalcitrant material, conforms to tradition—have been examined.

(2) At times, Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar's interpretation though it might conform to grammar and tradition, might be lacking in content and depart from a normal, and natural interpretation. This work has pointed out such places.

(3) Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar does not, in some places, scruplously follow his own dictum that the liberty of a poet must be within the bounds of grammar, and at such places his own interpretation exceeds the limits of grammar also. These points have been referred to in this thesis.

(4) Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar's commentary is mostly based upon refinement and culture. At places where the poet helps himself to the luxury of an image but at the cost of refinement and culture, he tries

to reconcile the passage, to the extent possible with the same. He succeeds in many places, but even his magic touch could not save some of the poems, especially in Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi, from such contradictions of traditional culture.

(5) Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar does not interpret passages piecemeal. He has a thorough understanding of the whole epic, and so even apparently insignificant words open a vista of visions for him and his is a complete picture that sets the epic in proper light. The ordinary epithets, demonstratives, intetrogatives, etc. are charged with splendid meanings, in conformity with the sequence of incidents in the epic.

(6) Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar exploits some of the ordinary similes and metaphors in the poems or epic, to literary advantages. He extends their scope and holds that they are used to refer to past or future incidents. Even the conventional vocative epithets, used by the characters to one another, appear to him to be filled with meaning or significance. The attributes of the upamān̲am and upamēyam become separate similes in the hands of Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar. The various stages of evolution that simile undergoes to blossom into metaphor are discussed with reference to Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar's interpretation of both (simile and metaphor).

(7) Synonymy and polysemy are not mere physical forms of poetic acrobatics to him, but essential mediums that convey a world of meanings colourful in their variety and deep in their significance and he enlivens every such word with his own scholarship.

(8) The later developments in language have been reconciled to the grammatical sanctions given by Tolkāppiyam and for this purpose the commentator extends the scope of the sutrams by various methods of interpretation. Such methods have been critically examined in this work.

(9) Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar's conceptions of 'ākupeyar' as against the traditional views have been investigated thoroughly. According to him ākupeyar is not based upon tradition and can be created as and when one desires, like an̲moḻittokai. He gets confused with ākupeyar, participial nouns and metaphors.

(10) From Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar's commentary it has been brought out that every tense contains the three sub-tense indications. There are nine tenses actually as derived from his work. All these tenses have been discussed with appropriate illustrations.

(11) The kinds of conjunctional suffix 'um' and the subtle variations in its meanings and conventional positions have been well brought out from the commentary of Naccinārkkiniyar. The 'um' in the negative sense has been classified into several sub-divisions and discussed in detail.

(12) The various subtle points derived by Naccinārkkiniyar's understanding of 'māṭṭēṟu' (application) have been analysed and dealt with in detail. It is to be understood from his commentary that the māṭṭēṟu plays an important role in reducing or increasing the scope of the meaning of one sutra and applying it to another.

(13) The order of placing ideas or things or the violation of it has various implications. All these implications, and various reasons for the order and its violation, have been investigated and classified.

(14) Naccinārkkiniyar uses the stress levels namely eṭuttal, paṭuttal, etc. junctures and pitch as phonemes differentiating the meanings of words and sentences and this is in conformity with the opinion of modern linguistic scholars to some extent.

(15) To the various types of sentences mentioned by Tolkāppiyar, Naccinārkkiniyar adds some more varieties which have been investigated and classified properly. The arrangement of subject, predicate, object, etc. in poetry is quite different from that in prose and the reasons for this have been studied and analysed as understood from Naccinārkkiniyar's commentary.

(16) The knowledge of semantic changes is important for the study of a language and literature and this is brought out with illustrations from Naccinārkkiniyar.

(17) The akṟiṇai nouns with no gender indication (Pālpakā akṟiṇai-p-peyar) is quite different from the nouns indicating 'Cāti orumai' and 'cāti-p-panmai' and this distinction has been pointed-out with literary examples.

(18) It appears that the scope of two kinds of the first personal plural pronouns, one excluding and the other including the second person addressed have not been defined clearly by grammarians. Of the first personal pronouns, the 'yām' series excludes the second person and includes the third person, and the 'nām' series includes the second person—and this is understood from Naccinārkkiniyar's interpretations. There are also some other peculiarities with reference to the second personal pronouns and they are brought out with appropriate illustrations from Naccinārkkiniyar's commentry.

(19) Naccinārkkiniyar's scholarship in Sanskrit language and literature, his knowledge in Political, Social and religious history, his acquaintance with Vēdās, ākamās, purāṇās, ithikāsās etc., his familiarity with the traditional knowledge of natural and physical sciences etc., have been discussed briefly in the previous pages of this chapter. All these subjects can be studied in detail in future. This thesis attempts and the following nine chapters will provide a critical study of Naccinārkkiniyar's erudite scholarship in the Tamil language and litreature alone.

PART I

NACCINĀRKKINIYAR AS A LITERARY CRITIC

CHAPTER 2

APPRECIATION OF POETRY

2.1. *The emphasis on the highest Ideals*

The literature of a language reflects the culture of the people who speak it. It reveals the tradition and social history and any work of a great poet should be studied in this light. In Tamil the poets aim at suggesting the highest ideals, but sometimes, these highest ideals may not be visible on the surface. Naccinārkkiniyar like other great commentators is never satisfied with the surface meaning. He dives deeper and succeeds in bringing out the real impact of the poets who are realistic in a sense emphasise the ideals to be always held in view by a society and culture on their march towards perfection.

2.1.1. *Chastity lights up the world*

In Maturaikkāñci there is a passage where the poet Marutan Iḷanākanār describes the beauty of the women who live happily with their husbands.

> "Tamaniyam vaḷayia tāvil viḷaṅkiḷai
> Nilam viḷakku uṟuppa mētaka-p-polintu"[1]

If we interpret the passage in a literal manner, it means that the women shone with the brightness of their golden ornaments lighting up the ground. But Naccinārkkiniyar is not satisfied with the literal-meaning of this passage. He cannot reconcile himself to the idea that all the good epithets should go to mere inanimate objects like ornaments. So he does not say that the brightness of their golden ornaments lights up the ground but instead he interprets it to mean that the greatest quality of the women, their chastity, lights up the world (not merely the ground, it should be noted) and he arrives at this meaning by interpreting the word 'mētaka' as 'endowed with the greatest quality of chastity'. This explanation is daringly original and reflects the tradition of Tamil history.

2.1.2. *Contradiction to Dharma*

There is a passage in Kuṟiñcikkali. The two young lovers have decided that each is born for the other and 'Gandharva Marriage' has

---

1. Maturai, 11. 704-705.

taken place. But the parents of the beloved decided to marry the heroine to somebody-else. At that time the lady companion of the heroine addresses the 'Cevili' (the foster mother):

"Ciṟu kuṭiyīrē ciṟukuṭiyīrē
Vaḷḷi kīḻ vīḻa varaimicai-t-tēṉ toṭā
Kollai kural vāṅki īṉā malai vāḻnar
Alla purintu oḻukalāṉ".[1]

She says that if the parents of the heroine decide to marry her to someone other than her lover, things, that are not good for the community, will take place. Here 'alla' means 'things that stand in contradiction to Dharma. Naccinārkkiṉiyar says that if things that stand in contradiction to Dharma are 'desired'—(interpreting the word 'purintu' as 'desired') then these bad things will occur. The main thing that stands in contradiction to Dharma is ignoring the lover who had saved the life of the girl when she was about to be drowned and to whom, because of his touching her in that act of saving, the girl had dedicated herself. This drawing out of the implication of 'alla' from the context is in accordance with the highest ideals. Naccinārkkiṉiyar's interpretation of 'purital' (to desire) is also important here. Though the word 'purital' has another meaning 'to do', Naccinārkkiṉiyar interprets it to mean 'to desire' because he is confident that even thinking of a bad thing amounts to the performance of it. In this connection one may cite Parimēlaḻakar's comment that 'thinking is doing'.[2]

2.1.3. *Chastity for men*

Chastity is the sterling quality prescribed not only for women but for men as well. Vaḷḷuvar calls this the real heroism in man. Naccinārkkiṉiyar is well aware of this dictum of Vaḷḷuvar, and he bears this in mind when he annotates a passage in Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi. Jīvaka's brother Nantaṭṭaṉ meets Kaṉakamālai, the wife of the former. Her body is wasting away because of the separation from Jīvakaṉ. This scene is described by Tēvar as follows :

"Tiṅkaḷ vāṇ mukamum nōkkāṉ
Tiru mulai-ttaṭamum nōkkāṉ
Aṅkatir-k-kalāpa miṉṉum
Aṇi alkul parappum nōkkāṉ
Ceṅkayal kaṇṇiṉāḷ taṉ
Ciṟaṭi-c-cilampu nōkki

1. Kali; v. 39; 11-14
2. Kuraḷ; Pari; preface to Chapter 29.

Eṅkuḷār aṭikaḷ eṉṉā
Iṉṉaṇam iyampiṉāṉē".[1]

The direct interpretation of this stanza would be that Nantaṭṭan does not look at the moon like face of Kaṉakamālai, does not look at the beautiful breasts; does not look at the 'alkul' (waist), but looks at the 'cilambu' on her feet and speaks, The poem, as interpreted thus, does not do credit to the poet. Here the reference to the face, breasts and waist seems to be unwarranted and such romantic imagery at a place where the woman in grief-stricken is repulsive.

The poet says that Nantaṭṭaṉ does not look at these things, and it is difficult to understand why the poet should have mentioned these things at all. "In fine, then, the power to appeal to the emotions is always combined in literature with other qualities. When this appeal is the chief purpose of a work, then we have poetry".[2] When the poet describes such a situation, poignant with grief and distress, such descriptions are extravagant and unnatural. "And when the moment of intense feeling comes, fine phrasing is out of question."[3]

But here Naccinārkkiṉiyar comes to the rescue of the poet and interprets it in a way, that, instead of doing injustice to the poet, heightens the beauty of the poem. His interpretation is as follows :

"Nantaṭṭaṉ does not look at the present paleness of the face that once looked like the moon; does not look at the present anaemic paleness that has come to stay in her once beautiful breasts; does not look at the dirty clothes that cover her once lovely waist (alkul) etc. But as he was standing with his head held down, he looks at her feet".

Here the grief of Kaṉakamālai and Nantaṭṭaṉ is beautifully portrayed. The state in which Kaṉakamālai was living after her separation from Jīvakan is dramatically presented. Her once beautiful looks are contrasted with her present grief-stricken condition, and this makes us feel sorry for her plight. The portrayal of Nantaṭṭaṉ, standing with his head hung down, heightens the picture of sorrow and this becomes one of the most picturesque situations described in poetry - and this is achieved, one should remember, by the remarkable presentation of Naccinārkkiṉiyar.

2.2. *Resolving Contradictions*

A superficial study of the great poets may sometimes make one feel that some parts of a particular poem contradict each other. But

1. Jīvaka; v. 1705.
2. Some principles of Literary Criticism; pp. 50-55.
3. The Discovery of Poetry; p. 184.

this is only apparent, and it becomes the duty of great commentators like Naccinārkkiniyar to reconcile this apparent contradiction.

2.2.1 *Implied contradiction*

Two ideas inconsistent with each other expressed in a poem, might be classified as a shortcoming, namely 'Māṟukoḷakkūṟal' in literary traditions,[1] if not properly understood.

"Iruvēm āynta maṉṟal itu"[2]

This line occurs in Kuṟiñci-p-pāṭṭu as a statement by the heroine. She is referring to the marriage that was solemnised earlier by the mutual consent of both the hero and the heroine. 'Āynta' normally means 'after deliberations'. So the line means, 'This is a marriage that has taken place after much deliberations'. There is a contradiction here, as the friend of the heroine refers to this consummation as something that has happened without any deliberation and without any reference to parental consent.[3] So the word 'āynta' cannot be interpreted to mean 'deliberation.' The genius of Naccinārkkiniyar has not failed him. The Akam tradition would have it that the vulnerable obstacles of dignity (Perumai) and determination (uraṉ) in the hero and fear (accam) and shyness (nāṇam) in the heroine, will gradually diminish as the mutual love for each other is on the increase; and the consummation takes place only when both these aspects reach their respective limits.[4] So Naccinārkkiniyar interprets this line to mean, "This is a marriage that has materialised after the respective aspects of dignity and determination, fear and shyness of the hero and heroine deminished". The word 'āynta' means diminished.'[5]

2.2.2. *Explicit contradiction - oxymoron*

In Kalittokai there occurs a line,

"Nalkūrntār celvamakaḷ"[6]

'Nalkūrntār' means 'impoverished', and 'celvam' means 'rich', and so a superficial reading of the line would be, 'the rich daughter of the impoverished parents'. This is a fundamental contradiction even in the sequence of ideas. If one does not have children, that itself is considered as 'poverty'. So Naccinārkkiniyar interprets this line as

1. Tol. Poruḷ; Pērā; s. 663.
2. Kuṟiñci; l. 21.
3. Kuṟiñci; ll. 30-32.
4. Iṟaiyaṉār; s. 9. p. 88.
5. Tol. Col. s. 330.
6. Kali; v. 50.

meaning, 'the rich daughter of the parents who suffered long the want of a child'.

2.2.3. *Idiomatic contradiction*

In Pattuppāṭṭu a line bearing a seeming contradiction in usage, occurs as follows :

"Karumpiṉ tīñcāṟu virumpiṉir micaimiṉ"[1]

Here 'micaital' means 'to eat'.[2] The literal meaning of this line would be 'eat the juice of the sugarcane'.[2] The sugar-cane juice can only be drunk and not eaten. Naccinārkkiṉiyar reconciles this line to mean, 'after drinking the juice of the sugarcane, eat the sugar candy".

Cāṟu virumpiṉir	-	juice drink (drink the juice)
(katti) micaimin	-	(sugar candy) eat (eat the sugar candy)

Thus by making tīñ cāṟu (sweet juice) the object of 'virumpiṉir' (which means according to Naccinārkkiṉiyar, drink), he brings in 'kaṭṭi' meaning sugar candy as the object of 'micaimiṉ' (eat); sugar-candy is here understood. (But 'micaital' itself means eating, drinking, licking etc.[3] If it is so, Naccinārkkiṉiyar's attempt to rationalise the usage of the word 'micaimiṉ' looks futile).

2.2.4. *Contradicting nature*

"Iṉ cāyal mārpaṉ"[4]

is a line occuring in Kalittokai which refers to the hero. Here 'cāyal' means - delicate.[5] This delicate trait is always attributed to women only. But here this line literally means 'the hero who possesses sweet and delicate chest', Naccinārkkiṉiyar's interpretation of this line is really something out of the ordinary. According to him, this line means to quote the words of the heroine, 'one who possesses my sweet and delicate chest'. (But "cāyal" meaning 'delicate' can be used in very few instances as a trait with reference to men. Puṟanāṉūṟu says Pāri is more sweet and delicate than water.[6] Here "cāyal" means 'charity'. So, here this line "In cāyal mārpaṉ" can also be interpreted as meaning 'one who has in abundance, the sweet quality of charity').

---

1. Perumpāṇ; l. 262
2. Kali; v. 50: 2, Akam; v. 29: 3.
3. Tol. Col. Cēṉā; ss, 46, 47
4. Kali; v. 65:5
5. Tol. Col, s, 325
6. Puṟam; v. 105.

2.3. *The Function of Ambiguous Verbs*

The Tamil grammarians refer to Taṭumāṟu toliṟ peyar (ambiguous verb).[1] For instance:

"Mīṉ Viḻuṅkiṉa paiyaṉ"
(fish swallowed boy)

This can be interpreted either as 'the fish that ate the boy' or 'the boy that ate the fish'. "Viḻuṅkiṉa" (swallowed is an ambiguous verb that can be attributed as a predicate (here transformed into a relative participle) either to the fish or to the 'boy'. Naccinārkkiṉiyar uses his knowledge of such verbs to literary advantage.

2.3.1. *Vēy nalam iḻanta tōḷ*

In Kalittokai there is a passage - 'Vēy nalam Iḻanta toḷ'[2]. 'Nilam īḻanta' means that which lost its 'charm'. What has actually lost the charm? Is it referring to the shoulders or the bamboo? 'Nalam iḻanta' can be attributed either to the bamboo or to the shoulders. Naccinārkkiṉiyar interprets the line thus: 'the bamboo has lost its charm because it cannot stand in comparison to the beauty of the shoulders'.

2.3.2. *Puṇ tavaḷ vēl kaṇ pāvai*

"Puṇ tavaḷ vēl kaṇ pāvai"[3] means 'wound-smelling Javelin-like eyes'. The smell of the wound is due to incessant killing of the foes. This is a traditional attribute. But Naccinārkkiṉiyar would not interpret this in this conventional manner. He says 'the Javelin that has caused wounds on foes :—'Puṇ tavaḷ vēl'—the Javelin that is responsible for the spread of wounds on enemies. This removes the odium on the javelin. Also when we compare the eyes to the javelin, the epithet, "wound smelling", looks unromantic. But now it would mean, the eyes, like the Javelin, have caused wounds in the hearts (symbolically) of those who see her. This heightens the beauty of the poem.

2.3.3. *Mai paṭu perum tōḻ maḻavar*

'Mai paṭu perum tōḷ Maḻavar'[4] is a line that occurs in Maturai-k-kāñci, Mai paṭutal-'kuṟṟam paṭutal' i.e. blemished. Which got blemished? Does 'maipaṭutal' refer to the shoulders of the valiant

1. Tol. Col, Nac; s. 96.
2. Kali; v. 99:16
3. Jīvaka; v. 239
4. Maturai; 1. 687.

heroes? No-Naccinārkkiniyar interprets this as referring to the shoulders of valiant heroes that are responsible for blemishing or creating a blot (symbolically meaning defeating)—the shoulders of the enemies. The word 'enemies' is understood as an object of 'paṭu' and 'maipaṭutal' becomes the verb attributing the agency to the tōḷ of maḻavar.

2 3.4. *Uṇṇunar-t-taṭutta-nuvaṇai*

There is a passage in Malaipaṭukatām "uṇṇunar taṭutta nuṇṇiṭi nuvaṇai"[1]. It literally means that the 'millet flour forbids those who come to eat'. The meaning is rather ambiguous, and does not convey any sensible idea. But the genius of Naccinārkkiniyar is not content with a literal interpretation of this line. So he investigates the matter still further. His meaning for this line is "the millet flour that has stopped those people who eat it from eating anything-else because of its own intrinsic sweet and delicious taste". There is another line in Malaipaṭukaṭām "cēṟu ciṟantu uṇṇunar taṭuttaṉa tēmā".[2] 'The fruits were so sweet that they did not allow the people to eat anything-else'. In Perumpāṇāṟṟuppaṭai there is a line

"Palaviṉ cūḻ cuḷai-p-perum paḻam."[3]

Here Naccinārkkiniyar, instead of making the word 'cūḻ' an attribute of the succeeding word 'cuḷai', which will mean 'crowded juice-contents'—makes the word an attribute for a word which is understood, 'those who eat' and interprets it as 'the juice contents that draw many people who get crowded and would not leave'. Thus the sweetness of the 'Palā' is heightened.

2.3.5. *Pūṇ aṇi mārpa*

A messenger goes to Caccantaṉ and informs him of the attack by Kaṭṭiyaṅkāraṉ. It was a convention in those days that when one addressed a king one had to eulogise him, wish him well and then speak. Accordingly the messenger addresses:

"Pūṇ aṇi mārpa"[4]

This line in the context of the convention described, should normally mean "you wearing jewels on your chest". But Naccinārkkiniyar is not content with such a prosaic interpretation as it would not be

1. Malai; 1. 445.
2. Malai; 1. 137-138
3. Perumpāṇ; 1. 356.
4. Jīvaka; v. 264.

suitable in this context of war in which Caccantan̲ is going to be involved. So, he feels when the messenger addresses him as "Pūṇaṇi Mārpa", perhaps he is reminding Caccantan̲ of his valour which is evident in the phrase—"Pūṇaṇi mārpa" which is interpreted to mean, 'The brave chest that is responsible for its enemies to wear the armour in self-defence'. This heightens the beauty of the poem as the phrase 'Pūṇaṇi' annotated thus conveys truly the spirit of the circumstances i.e. the impending war and Caccantan̲'s duty therein. This reminds us of a passage in Rāmāyaṇam where Han̲umān̲, after his successful mission to Laṅka, returns to Rāmā, conveys the message of Sītī and in doing so, addresses him:

"Vir̲ perum taṭan tōḷ vīra"[1].

It implies that everything is set now and only he had to provide food for his bow.

2.3.6. *Mulai vaitta taṭam*

Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar, who, thus following tradition, makes the chest of kings the seat of valour, makes in a similar way the chest of women the seat of beauty. Kēmacari's chest is described as:

"Mulai vaitta taṭattu"[2]

i.e. the place where the breasts are located. This looks rather absurd and by no stretch of imagination can be called poetry. But Naccin̲ārakkin̲iyar's interpretation makes it a very beautiful concert. "Taṭam", he means a 'small place' and "Mulai vaitta taṭam" means 'the small place that is left by the breasts'. The breasts though full leave a small portion out of affection and sentiment for their birth place (the chest). Out of generosity, they refrain from occupying the whole area of their birth place.

2.4. *The Importance of Poetic Names*

When a poet refers to a certain character by certain attributes or one of his characters addresses another using some attributes, these attributes may for all outward appearances look as used in a generic way rather than out of any particular reason. Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar would not consider these attributes as conventional poetic names, but would go deeper into their significance and find some rational explanation for them. When many attributes are available, he would put this question to himself, "why should that particular poetic name have been choosen in preference to others?" He would

1. Kampar; Suntara kāṇṭam; v. 1312
2. Jīvaka; 1514.

analyse it and bring out its importance, and this is one of his methods of literary appreciation.

"May be the poet might have used those epithets in the same sense as Naccinārkkiniyar explains them to keep in conformity with his literary genius. Eventhough the poet might have used some epithets in a conventional way, if the literary critic is able to rationalise them and find some coherent beauty in the same, we cannot but appreciate it. Perhaps it is the duty of the literary critic to engage himself in such pursuits"[1].

2.4.1. *Vaḷḷal*

Tiruttakka Tēvar refers to Jivakan at two places, as 'Vaḷḷal', 'Puravalan' (Philanthropist, or patron). Since Jivakan is the hero of Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi, it is but natural that he should have been so referred to, to befit his greatness. But Naccinārkkiniyar cannot reconcile himself to this kind of barren interpretation. He feels that there should be other reasons for this reference. He thinks that these words should have some special significance in the particular context.

The many kings who lost 'Tattai' to Jīvakan, in the Vīṇā(yāḷ) competition, under the instigation of Kaṭṭiyaṅkāran, declare war against Jīvakan. And he bends his bow, and shoots arrows that frighten away many kings and make them take to their heels. Their Royal umbrellas are broken, shields shattered etc. Here Jīvakan is referred to by the poet as 'Vaḷḷal' (Philanthropist)[2] It looks rather ridiculous that Jīvakan should be called a 'Vaḷḷal' when he has wrought a complete destruction of the possession of the other kings. So Naccinārkkiniyar pauses and thinks why the poet should have called Jīvaka a 'Vaḷḷal' He argues that, as Jīvakan while scaring them away by smashing their 'Royal 'Fans' and 'umbrellas', has spared their lives by not killing them, he is called 'Vaḷḷal'—here he has granted their lives to them, and has thus proved himself a generous giver.

2.4.2. *Puravalan*

There is yet another place where Jīvakan is referred to as "Puravalan" (patron or guardian). Kaṭṭiyaṅkaran's soldiers arrest Jīvikan and while he is taken prisoner, the poet uses this epithet—"Puravalan" while referring to him.[3] "Puravalan" means 'patron'

1. Ilakkiyakkalai; p. 41.
2. Jīvaka; v. 797
3. Jīvaka; v. 1096.

or 'guardian', It is not very difficult for Jīvakan̲ to set himself free from Kaṭṭiyaṅkāran̲'s men by killing them all as that suits his skill, but he does not do it and hence, he is a custodian of their lives.

2.4.3. *Cilaivalāy*

An̲aṅkamālai is in love with Jīvakan̲, but she is kidnapped by Kaṭṭiyaṅkāran̲ and he embraces her. But she is thinking only of Jīvakan̲ and she cries in distress. "Cilai valāi Jīvakasāmi come and embrace me"[1]. "Cilaivalāy" just means 'you, who are well versed in using the bow', but Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar says that this form of address is used deliberately and there is some special significance for the same. 'You who are well-versed in using the bow' please come and show your skill to defeat the designs of this villain.' Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar gives this interpretation for this way of addressing him and also it looks apt in this context.

2.4.4. *Cilaivittakan̲ē*

Kēmacari, after her separation from Jīvakan̲, thinks of him and pines away in grief. She thinks of the good old days of romantic thrill, quarrels etc. To pacify her, sometimes Jīvakan̲ used to prostrate himself on the floor and caress her feet. She indulges in this sort of soliloquy addressing Jīvakan̲ therein as

'Cilai vittakan̲ē'.[2]

which means literally, 'one who is well versed in using the bow'. But Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar is not satisfied with a literal interpretation of this line. So he says 'the bow as it bends more, causes greater harm, so also the more Jīvakn̲ bends down before her, he has some ulterior aim that might cause her harm in the romantic sense. There are many other similar instances in Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar's commentary.[3]

2.4.5. *Makkaḷ and Mākkaḷ*

The first 'a' in the former is a short vowel, and the same in the latter is a long one. Both words mean, 'people'. People endowed with only five senses are called "Mākkaḷ" (long) and people with six senses are called 'Makkaḷ' (short)[4]. But in actual usage in

---

1. Jīvaka; v. 687.
2. Jīvaka: v. 1514.
3. Porunar; l. 212, Kali; v. 114:8 Jīvaka; vv. 393, 1661, 2221 etc.
4. Tol. Porul Pērā; ss. 587, 588

literature, both of them are used without any discrimination but Naccinārkkiniyar following Tolkāppiyam always differentiates these two terms. In Porunarāṟṟuppaṭai there occurs a phrase :

"Tavam cey Mākkaḷ"[1]

the second Mākkaḷ (long) is used here. Naccinārkkiniyar feels that there should be some reason for the poet to use this particular word in this context, and he is able to find one. The meaning of this line would be 'those who by Tapas (Penance) are able to achieve all the material benefits of this life". The ultimate goal is Mōksha and it should be the sole aim of Tapas. But the people referred to here do Tapas to enjoy only the material benefits and as such, Naccinārkkiniyar argues they do not deserve to be called ' Makkaḷ ' gifted with six senses, but must be only called as 'Mākkaḷ' (long) and hence the poet has used this word.

2.4.6. *Maṭam*

"Maṭavōr kāṭci nāṇi kata vaṭaittu" is another line in Pattuppāṭṭu[2]. The Pāṇar (Musicians) are having their humble gruel after shutting the doors of their house. They feel shy of others seeing their simple and humble food. Here on lookers are referred to as 'Maṭavōr' meaning 'ignorant'. Naccinārkkiniyar attaches some importance to this word 'Maṭavōr'. He feels that the poet should have used it for some specific reason. They are ignorant according to him, because they do not know that poverty is not a sin and one should not be blamed for the same. Fortune turns like a wheel and one who is rich today may become poor tomorrow and the one poor today may become rich tomorrow. So Naccinārkkiniyar says that they are ignorant as they do not know even this simple thing.

2.5. *The Significance of Attributes*

The poets employ attributes to glorify a thing or sometimes its action. The attributes not only have their natural meanings but have some extra significance as well which is well-understood only by great commentators. The commentator if he concerns himself only with the linguistic study, cannot conceive of the deep meaning inside, but would know its part of speech and linguistic associations. But, for a literary critic, it is a treasure house of information replete with literary possibilities.

1. Porunar; i. 91.
2. Ciṟupāṇ; 1. 138.

2. 5. 1. *Same attribute with different meanings*

The same epithet may mean differently at different places according to its association.

1. Kallā Iḷaiñar collikkāṭṭa.
2. Kallā Iḷaiyar mella-t-taivara.
3. Kallā Iḷaiñar Kāvaḷam kaippa.
4. Kallā māntaroṭu nakuvaṉar tiḷaippa.
5. Aruvarai Vīḻnta taṉ kallā-p-pārppu.
6. Kallā-k-kaṭṭiyaṅkāraṉ.
7. Kallā māntiri viḻuṅkappaṭṭāṉ.
8. Kallā Iḷaiyar Kalaṅkā-c-cirippoliyum.

The same word 'kallā' is used in all these places. Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar finds different meanings for this word and selects them according to the situation. 'Kallā' according to Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar, means those who have not learnt anything-else except their own occupation. 'Kalla Iḷaiñar' or 'Kallā Iḷaiyar' are those youths who run on small errands ordered by their masters, and they do not know anything-else except this[1]. In another place 'Kallā Iḷaiñar' means those who attend to the elephant, and whose knowledge of things does not extend beyond this[2]. 'Kallāmāntar' in Maturaikkāñci refers to those people who are enjoying all the time with women and so according to Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar, they have not learnt anything beyond this[3].

In some places, he does not hold 'Kallā' as a negative word, but considers this as an affirmative word. Kallā - 'who have learnt'. He says those youths who have fully learnt the art of eulogising the king[4]. In 'Kallā Iḷaiñar' those youths who attend on elephants know some of the Sanskrit words used to tame the elephants. But their knowledge of Sanskrit is not fundamental. So Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar says these have not learnt Sanskrit basically but have learnt some of the words used to tame the elephants[5].

The phrase Kallā-p-pārppu occurs in Malaipaṭukaṭām[6]. Here it refers to the little one of the monkey. As it has not learnt leaping, it has to hold to its mother. But, at one time it has forgotten to

1. Porunar; 1.100. Ciṟupāṇ; 1.33.
2. Mullai; 1. 36.
3. Maturai; 1. 420.
4. Porunar; 1. 100.
5. Mullai; 1. 36.
6. Malai; 1. 312.

do so and it falls. So, naturally the poet says that 'Kallā' means 'that which has not learnt holding to its mother. It must be noted that the commentator has not brought out the meaning of this word in Jīvaka Cintāmaṅi, as he has scrupulously done in Sangam classics.[1]

2.5.2. *Attribute with special significance*

The natural attributes in poetry have also some special significance for the commentator. When a poet describes the sea, we would naturally say, the sea with waves that are thrown on the shore. Such a thing occurs in Kalittokai:

"Kuṟiyiṉṟi-p-paṉṉāḷ niṉ,
Kaṭun tiṇṭēr varu patam kaṇṭu
Eṟi tirai imiḻ kāṉal
Etir koṇṭāḷ"[2]

Here the heroine is looking forward to the arrival of the hero. She has been waiting for him, hoping to hear the sound of his chariot. She is waiting at the sea shore. The sea-shore is described "Eṟi tirai imiḻ kāṉal." That the waves should roar is a natural description of the seashore. But, for Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar the description of the roaring of the sea, has a special meaning, in as much as in spite of the sea roaring, heroine has been keenly waiting to hear the sound of the chariot, and she could feel it too. Such is her love for the hero and only to describe this, the imagery of the roaring sea is described. The backdrop of the roaring sea, the picture of the heroine waiting at the sea-shore with her ears sharp to recognise the sound of the chariot of her lover, — all these create an atmosphere of absolute beauty and charm.

2.5.3. *Words with and without attributes*

Certain words by themselves have one meaning, and when used as attributes. have another. Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar discerns the meaning of both. The poet describes the Ēmāṅkata country :—

"Naṟṟavam ceyvārkku iṭam;
Tavam ceyvārkkum aktu iṭam.
Naṟ poruḷ ceyvārkku iṭam.
Poruḷ ceyvārkkum aktu itam".[3]

1. Jīvaka: vv. 385, 747, 2978.
2. Kali; v. 127: 10-11.
3. Jīvaka: v. 77.

Naccinārkkiniyar interprets the words in the following way :—

Tavam	—	A good domestic life on the foundation of Dharma having in view the life beyond
Naṟṟavam	—	Tavam done for attaining of Mōksha.
Poruḷ	—	Wealth that is not permanent.
Naṟporuḷ	—	Education that teaches what is permanent

2.5.4. *Contradictory attributes*

The characteristic trait of a particular thing described as an attribute may precede as an adjective or succeed as a predicate such as "Naṟ poruḷ nilai uṭaiyatu". Sometimes there may be apparent contradiction in the description and Naccinārkkiniyar interprets them in his own way, relieving them of such contradiction.

"Cel icai nilaiiya paṇpin
Nalliyakkōṭan"[1]

Here 'Icai' meaning 'fame' which has been attributed by two words : cel (attribute word) and 'nilaiiya' (predicate word) 'Cel, 'means that which goes away' and 'nilaiiya' means, 'that which is permanent'. Both stand in contradiction to each other. So Naccinārkkiniyar explains them without contradiction, — the 'fame' that does not stand in others (that goes away) but which stands permanent with reference to the hero described (Nalliya-k-kōṭan).

2.5.5. *Ill-placed attributes*

There are some attributes that appear ill-placed with reference to certain nouns. In Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi, there is a passage, which describes the marriage arranged by the parents for their girls. Even if the bridegrooms are as bad as monkeys, the brides have to take them as their husbands and worship them. Here referring to the monkey it is said

"Nan kuranku"[2]

'Nan' means 'good'. But here kuraṅku (monkey) occurs not in a good sense. The attribute 'nan' is ill-placed. So Naccinārkkiniyar interprets the attribute so as to avoid the want of propriety i.e. "the monkey which is good for bad things". This relieves the passage of the contradiction and also indirectly suggests that those youths may be apparently good but their goodness is only for bad things.

1. Ciṟupāṇ; 11. 268-269.
2. Jīvaka; v. 1997.

2.5.6. *Attributes with different meanings*

Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar's commentary is great from another point of view. It consists in bringing out the full force and beauty of attributes or epithets when sometimes the seeming attriubute is explained.

"Nuṇ mati pōn̲r̲u tōn̲r̲ā nuṇukiya nucuppin̲ār"[1]

Like the keen intellect of a learned person, the waist that is not obvious to our eyes. Caccantan̲ loses his kingdom because of his excessive love for women. Vijaiyai, his wife laments over his fate and mentions this in particular. Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar does not consider the attribute 'Nuṇmati', as describing the waist of a woman, as such comparisons in this context are extravagent. Therefore he contends that this particular line refers to the incident i.e. Caccantan̲'s handing over the administration to Kaṭṭiyaṅkāran̲ which appeared to be an act of subtle intelligence. In other words this particular action of giving the administrative reins to his minister seems to the king as the only wise thing he could do. So the commentator is justified in explaining the passage in this way as the wife of the late lamented king would not with any propriety describe the waist of women so deliberately in such tragic circumstances especially when she is speaking of herself through that reference to women. Literature is that which describes right emotion at the right place.

2.6. *Demonstratives and Interrogatives*

Great poets, when they refer to a thing or an incident that has been described earlier would refer to the same by demonstratives, — atu, itu, aktu, iktu, an̲n̲atu, in̲n̲atu, an̲n̲an̲, in̲n̲an̲, an̲n̲ēn, āṅku, īṅku etc., and if they have to put it in the question form they use interrogatives: etu, yātu, en̲, etc. Those things that are referred to, might precede the demonstratives or interrogatives or succeed them which are distant or proximate or that which is known only to one's ownself. Either the description consists of a single word or of many words, Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar finds special significance in all these things. He interprets them in a way that makes even these mechanical devices of demonstratives and interrogatives attain special meaning and beauty.

2.6.1. *The demonstrative 'a' that comes as an attribute*

The marriage of Jīvakan̲ with Kuṇamālai is described by the poet. Jīvakan̲, who marries Kuṇamālai is here mentioned by a phrase.

---

1. Jīvaka; v. 2611.

"A-v-vēṉilāṉ" (that Maṉmataṉ)[1]

What does the demonstrative attribute 'a' (that) mean here? There is no previous reference to him at all in this poem. So, Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar obviously think it should be referring to something-else. He interprets the idea in a very ingenious way. Maṉmataṉ, the God of Love, has no physical form as he has been burnt down by 'Lord Siva'. So, to compare Jīvakaṉ to Maṉmataṉ, whose physical form had been destroyed, is not apt. Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar, therefore concludes that "a + vēṉilāṉ" i.e. "that Maṉmataṉ" refers to that Maṉmataṉ who had his physical from before Siva burnt him. So he says "a" refers to:

"Nutal Viḻikku aḻiyāta kāmaṉ"

"that Maṉmataṉ not burnt by the eye on the forehead of Lord Siva."

2.6.2, *The demonstratives 'aṉṉa', 'iṉṉa'*

The Porunaṉ (musician) who is entertained by the king undergoes a metamorphosis. He says the physical form he had the previous evening (i.e. the impoverished state) before meeting Karikālā, and the physical form he has now (prosperous) after having been entertained by Karikālā, are so different that they have no relation to each other, and people who have seen him on both the occasions are surprised to see the change. Here the line that occurs:

"Mālai aṉṉatōr puṉamaiyum"[2]

It means, 'that impoverished state in which he was the previous evening'. Here Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar investigates the use of the demonsrative 'aṉṉatu'. He calls it:

"Neṉcari cuṭṭu"

It means, 'that which he himself or his mind alone knows' i.e. 'the impoverished state which was well-known to him'. The big family that is always in a state of abject penury,[3] the poverty that sends these people to seek their patrons like birds that would seek the trees with plenty of fruits,[4] the famished bodies,[5] the clothes that were

1. Jīvaka; v. 1063.
2. Porunar; l. 96.
3. *Ibid*; ll. 61-62.
4. Porunar; ll. 64-67.
5. Porunar; l. 68.

ruled by lice and their eggs[1] — all these conditions are well described by that demonstrative "aṉṉatu". So Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar says it is "neñcari cuṭṭu". There are other passages also where Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar investigates and gives the meanings of the demonstratives used in this manner.[2]

2.6.3. *The demonstrative 'īṅku'*

Jīvakaṉ, after leaving his wife Kamacari, passes through a forest. There he stays in a beautiful garden and witnesses two scenes. Aṉaṅkamāvīṇai, a beautiful woman, falls in love with Vaṉacaritaṉ and tries to attract him. But he, controlling his own senses, spurns this offer, and attempts to make her understand the cheapness of lust.[3] But at another place, Aṉaṅkamāvīṇai's husband Bavadattaṉ thinks of her, and pines away in grief.[4] Jīvakāṉ, who is a witness to both scenes, smiles within himself. He goes to Vaṉacaritaṉ, and when he welcomes him, he tells:

"Īṅkē iru nī"[5]

This means normally "Here stay thou". But in the hands of Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar, the demonstrative 'iṅkē' in this phrase developes a beautiful meaning which suits the context. Vaṉacaritaṉ rises in the esteem of Jīvakaṉ, as he, controlling his own senses, advises her to vacate all such evil thoughts from her mind, emphasising the cheapness of lust, This attracts Jīvakaṉ to a great extent, and so he says: "Īṅkē iru nī". It means, 'you continue to be like this in the same situation' i e. with such determination for ever — Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar interprets "Īṅkē iru 'nī'' as meaning 'hold your mind as you have done now without allowing it to go as it pleases'. This is more or less a quotation from Tirukkuraḷ.[6] So he contends that 'īṅku' is an uvama urupu (a sign denoting the comparison) like "āṅku" (this is interpreted as an uvama urupu which has also the force of the proximate demonstrative suggested by the comparison). Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar's interpretation for this demonstrative 'īṅku' heightens the beauty of the poem.

2.6.4. *The interrogative 'en'*

Jīvakaṉ tells Bavadattaṉ all the evils of lust, but he himself later on thinks of Tattai and feels for the separation. In spite of his

---

1. *Ibid*; ll. 79-81.
2. Kali; v. 140 : 12. Jīvaka; vv. 1261, 1288, 1669.
3. Jīvaka; vv. 1567-1585.
4. *Ibid*; vv. 1586-1592.
5. Jivaka; v. 1593.
6. Kūraḷ; v· 422.

efforts to control himself he could not and all his learning which primarily concerns itself in teaching a man how to control his senses and culture is of no avail before his love for the woman. When a man is in love, even his learning is of no use as it is not able to teach him self-control. Jīvakaṉ thinks like this and says :

"Eṇṇum eṉ ne ṉcu"[1]

It literally means "my mind thinks." But Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar does not interpret this in this manner, but says: "Eṅṅum neñcu eṉ"— my mind thinks' and he finds a separate meaning for the word 'eṉ' which is according to him an interrogative. He says that Jīvakaṉ is thinking aloud that what evil thing he could have done as even his education is of no avail at a time when it is very necessary that it should teach him self-control. 'Eṉ neñcu' means 'my mind' literally. Also 'neṉcu in this context should mean only "my mind." So, the word 'en' is superfluous. This is the reason why Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar interprets the word 'eṉ' as referring to the idea quoted above. What apparently seems to us as superflous, in the hands of Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar, attains special significance and deep meaning.

2.6.5. *Demonstrative with interrogative*

Jīvakaṉ defeats Kaṭṭiyaṅkāraṉ and this war is elaborately described by Tiruttakka dēvar. There is a particular incident where a warrior (belonging to the enemy) encounters Vipulaṉ (Jīvakaṉ's brother) and asks him to stab him, as both are equals. Vipulaṉ says :

"Atuvō"[2]

What does this demonstrative pronoun 'atu' (that) refer to? Is there any special significance for the interrogative suffix 'ō'? There was a tradition in olden days to offer one's chest for the enemy's sword, and it was considered as the height of valour. Accordingly the warrior offers himself to Vipulaṉ for being stabbed. But Vipulaṉ, thinking of this tradition, does not want to offer this fame to the warrior so easily. So he says : "Do you want to achieve fame, like that? No I will not give you". Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar says that this is the meaning of "atu ō". (Is it that?) 'Atu ō' is pregnant with the meaning according to Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar. Atu (it) refers to the fame mentioned above. 'O' occurs in the negative sense meaning "I shall

1. Jīvaka; v. 1632.
2. Jīvaka; v. 2263.

not give you that opportunity". This is evident from the fact that Vipulaṉ laughed because he did it in a satirical way. Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar's splitting of the words as 'atu' and 'ō' and exploiting them to literary advantage is really remarkable and it reminds us of the statement of a great scholar". "When anyone wants to give vent to a strong feeling he does not stop to consider the logical analysis of his ideas, but language furnishes him with great many adequate means of bringing the state of his mind to the consciousness of his hearer or hearers"[1].

2.7. *Singular Plural-Mixture*

In the poetry of eminent poets, sometimes there might be a mixture of numbers-singular and plural, what might apparently seem a grammatical error. But great commentators explain this mixture in a satisfactory fashion. Tolkāppiyar has also sanctioned this mixture in his grammar.[2] So Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar follows the rules of Tolkāppiyar in this connection and also explains other places that occur in violation of Tolkāppiyam, where he brings out the literary advantage accruing through such mixture of numbers.

2.7.1. *Singular for plural*

The cowherds celebrate 'Ēṟu taḷuval'. It means that "he who would tame the wild bulls could marry the girl to whom they belong". The girl is praying that her lover should be able to tame the bulls. At this time her left eyelid throbs. This is a good omen for women. So she is happy that her lover would be able to tame the bulls. This occurs in Kalittokai.

"Vēḷāṇmai ceytaṉa kaṇ"[3]

'Vēḷāṇmai ceytaṉa' means 'indicated good'. 'Ceytaṉa' is a plural predicate ; 'kaṇ' (meaning eye), though elsewhere it may be common to both the singular and plural is here singular as only the throbbing of the left eyelid indicates good. Here the poet has used a plural predicate for a singular subject. It is an error according to the rules of grammar. But Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar by his interpretation removes what apparently seems to us, a mistake. He says that 'Vēḷāṇmai ceytaṉa' means "indicated good" i.e. the right eyelid does not throb (that is also an indication of good) and the left eyelid throbs and in this way both the eyes have indicated good one by throbbing and the other by not throbbing. So 'kaṇ' according to him is plural and it justifies the predicate 'ceytaṉa'.

---

1. Essentials of English Grammer; p. 105.
2. Tol. Col. Nac; ss. 461, 462.
3. Kali; v. 101 : 45-46.

2.7.2. *Plural for Singular*

There is another situation where plural subject and predicate have been used for singular subject and predicate. In Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi the maidens of Kuṇamālai and Curamañcari bring their respective 'cuṇṇam' to Jīvakaṉ and ask him which of them is better prepared. Jīvakaṉ, when they are brought to him, says 'Ivai nalla'.[1] It means 'These are good' since he is asked to state specifically which of them is good, his reply, 'these are good', which literally means 'both are good' is not an answer to the question put to him and we naturally think that a person of the ingenuity of Jīvakaṉ, would not commit such a blunder. 'Ivai nalla'—is grammatically correct but it is not an answer to the question asked. The maidens, who took the 'cuṇṇam' to him, think that he has not specifically answered the question and feel sorry for the same. But Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar states Jīvakaṉ has answered their question properly. According to him, Jīvakaṉ says that this 'cuṇṇam' prepared by Kuṇamālai is better than the one prepared by Curamañcari. If so why is he using 'ivai' (these) the plural instead of the singular 'itu' (this)? 'Cuṇṇam' however is prepared by a mixture of various things-and so, when Jīvakaṉ says 'Ivai nalla' (they are good), he has in mind the various good ingredients that have gone to make the good mixture of that 'cuṇṇam' and so the plural indicates only those things. In this way Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar's explanation brings out the subtlety of Jīvakaṉ's remark.

2.8. *The Scope of Compound Words*

There are phrases with close juncture that occur qualifying the succeeding nouns. They have the characteristic of a single word like Karuṅkutirai (Black horse).[2] But Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar does not interpret this as a phrase that qualifies the succeeding noun but treats the words separately which, as a matter of fact, is in the interests of the consistency of the passage. Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar writes his commentary on a work, only after an exhaustive study of the whole work. So when he interprets an earlier passage he bears in mind that which succeeds much later. We have discussed elsewhere how Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar splits the words to grammatical advantage.[3] Now we are concerned with the same from a literary point of view.

2.8.1. *Katuntiṟal nōykaḷum*

Cutanjaṇaṉ, a Dēvaṉ teaches Jeevaka three Mantras and their effects. The effect of one Mantra is described thus:-

1. Jīvaka; v. 884.
2. Tol. Eḻuttu. Nac; ss. 24, 26 etc.
3. Infra; p. 186, 6. 4. 2.

"Pāmpum allavum
Kaṭuntiṟal nōykaḷum keṭukkum"[1]

"Kaṭuntiṟal nōykaḷ"—means literally, if one forgets for a moment how Naccinārkkiniyar has interpreted this, "serious diseases". Kaṭuntiṟal normally qualifies nōykaḷ (diseases) but Naccinārkkiniyar does not interpret this like this. He says "Kaṭuntiṟals and noykaḷ"—Here Kaṭuntiṟals' mean, according to him, air, fire and water. The Mantram that is taught by the Dēva will make the poisons, and snakes etc. and air, fire and water, and diseases inffective. Why should this line be interpreted thus? When a forest fire surrounds a group of elephants, Jīvakan̲ pronounces the Mantra which brings rain and relief to the elephants.[2] He is able to do this because of the Mantra he learns from Cutañjaṇan̲. Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar's anticipation of this passage coming much later is really remarkable. There is another line

"Kōpperuntēvi Koṟṟak kōmakan̲".[3]

Here Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar does not annotate the phrase Kōpperuntēvi' directly as meaning, 'the queen' but split the word into two, 'kō' and 'Peruntēvi' meaning, the king and the queen. Koṟṟakkōmakan̲ here means the son of the king. The whole line means,

"King Dan̲apati, Queen Tilōttamai, prince Ulōkapālan̲"

only these three people were concerned with the marriage of Patumai with Jīvakan̲.

2.8.2. *Kaṭṭil*

Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar has another way of splitting i. e. he will split not a compound but a single word itself (that lends itself for such splitting) which may apparently seem unnecessary. Jīvakan̲ and Vimalai after their marrige are immersed in happiness.

"Kaṭṭil ēṟiya kāmaru kāḷaiyum
Maṭṭu vāy aviḷ māmalar-k-kōtaiyum".[4]

Here the natural meaning of the word 'kaṭṭil' is 'cot'. But Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar is not content with a prosaic and crude interpretation of the word, but he splits the word into 'kaṭṭu+il' meaning family life to which Jīvakan̲ is well and truly bound.

1. Jīvaka; v. 1218.
2. Jīvaka; v. 1237.
3. *Ibid*; v. 1343.
4. Jīvaka; v. 1981.

2.8.3. *Kāvalan̲*

Vijayai, Jīvakan̲'s mother, when she meets her friends tells the story of Jīvakan̲'s father.

"Taraṇi kāvalan̲ Caccantan̲ en̲pavan̲
Paraṇi nāḷ pir̲antān̲ pakai yāvaiyum
Araṇilān̲ en̲kaṇ taṅkiya an̲pin̲āl
Iraṇiyan̲ paṭṭatu emmir̲ai eytin̲ān̲"[1]

Vijaiyai laments the loss of her husband Caccantan̲ who, because of his excessive love for her, suffered the same fate as Iraṇiyan̲.

Taraṇi kāvalan̲ Caccantan̲

Here this phrase means Caccantan̲, the custodian of the earth i.e. King Caccantan̲. But Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar splits the word as Taraṇi kāvalan̲ i.e. ka+alan̲; "the king, because of his excessive love for her, was not a custodian as he should have been." Here it gives entirely the opposite meaning. Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar gives the reason why Caccantan̲ was defeated by Kaṭṭiyaṅkāran̲. He did not do the normal function of a king i.e. giving protection and security for the people. He did not do this because of his excessive love for his wife and he was all the time engaged in seeking the pleasures of married life. This meaning reads better in the poem.

2.8.4. *Mun̲ivarum*

Kaluḷavēkan̲ addresses Cītattan̲. He says that if women were to live alone without their husbands, theirs is a miserable life.

"Mun̲ivarum pōkapūmi-p-pōkam muṭṭātu per̲r̲um
Tan̲iyavarāki vāḻtal cātuyar atan̲in̲ illai"[2]

These lines mean that even if they were to be saints happily endowed with all the pleasures of the "Swarga pūmi" (heaven), if they were to live alone, sorrow is as great as death itself. Here it looks though the poet emphasises the importance of married life, he has apparently done injustice to the saints. But the author of Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi is himself a saint. Would he have brought down the prestige of the saints like this? So Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar interprets the line by splitting the word 'Mun̲ivarum'—'Mun̲ivu+arum' i.e. the Swarga pūmi that cannot be disliked. Even if women were to have the pleasures of a

1. Jīvaka; 1813.
2. Jīvaka; v. 553.

Swarga pūmi, that cannot be disliked, where they were to live alone, the sorrow is as great as death itself.

2.8.5. *Ni̱naintirukkum*

There are verbs which have the characteristic of a single word, which usually are not split into two. But according to Nacci̱nārk-ki̱niyar the poet would not use unnecessary particles in addition to the main verbs. In such places Nacci̱nārkki̱niyar interprets two different meanings and heightens the beauty of the poem.

The companion of the heroine wants to impress upon her the hero's pathetic plight, and his request. He comes, entreats and bows to her. But she is afraid that this action of his, should not draw any public attention as it might lead to criticism. So she prevents him from doing that and so she says:

"Pōkkuṅkāl pōkku ni̱naintirukkum"[1].

It means when he is asked to leave, he thinks of leaving. 'Ni̱nain-tirukkum' means 'thinks'—it is a single word used as such normally. But Nacci̱nārkki̱niyar splits the word into two 'Ni̱naintu' (thinks) and 'Irukkum' (stays). When he is asked to leave he thinks of the distress that the separation is giving and hence he stays. If it is interpreted as to mean that he thinks of leaving and since thinking amounts to action, it will mean he would leave. But this will not bring home the persistent attitude of the hero in achieving his aim, and hence, the companion of the heroine cannot also convince herself of the true love he has for her. The persistence of the hero in staying there is very well brought out by Nacci̱nārkki̱niyar's commentary. 'Irukkum' that appears as an unnecessary word, in the hands of Nacci̱nārkki̱niyar, becomes a useful vehicle that beautifully portrays the Akam traditions.

2.8,6. *Uyttiṭṭa̱nar*

The people in the forest region go to the king and complain of their cattle (cows) being forcibly driven away by the hunters. It occurs thus :

"I̱raiyaṇikkēṭka uyttiṭṭa̱nar pū cal"[2]

It means that cowherds go very near the king and shout so that he can hear. 'Iṭu' is an auxiliary verb. But Nacci̱nārkki̱niyar splits the phrase as—

1. Kali; v. 63:3.
2. Jīvaka; v. 427.

"Pūcal uyttu iṭṭaṉar"

meaning, that the cowherds carried the blame and placed it on the shoulders of the king. It is the duty of the king to guarantee safety and security for the people. But here, he has failed in his duty. This is driven home by the cowherds and this is obvious only when it is interpreted as "uyttu iṭṭaṉar". (Parimēlaḷakar also interprets the verb 'uytturaittār' like this).[1]

2.8.7. *Maṟantiruntār*

Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar splits the verb in a different way also. There is a line in Kalittokai:

'Maṟantiruntār eṉṉāy nī
Malaiyiṭai vantakkāl'[2]

It means "without creating an impression that you have forgotten us, you are coming, crossing the mountains." Here we anticipate that Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar will split the word 'Maṟantiruntār' into Maṟantu+iruntār'. But he does not do so, contrary to our expectations. But he splits the word as "Maṟam+Tiruntār" and again 'tiruntār' is used according to Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar as a positive word. The line means according to Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar that "you are coming crossing the mountains, not withstanding the people of the forest regions who are capable of killing you". Here the hero's adventurous mood is beautifully portrayed. Also in the earlier lines, the lady companion describes all the hazards, the hero is facing when he comes to the heroine, hazards like snake, darkness etc.[3] So it is befitting that this also should be interpreted in this manner, and it has a continuity in thinking. Only the valour of the hero is aptly revealed if it is said that he, in spite of all these hazards, comes with a solitary determination to meet the heroine.

2.9. *The Splitting of Sentences*

Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar also splits the sentences to literary advantage.

2.9.1. *Iṉyāḷ itu uyttu-k-koṭumō*

During a yāḷ (Vīṇā) competition, Tattai tells her friend Vīṇāpati to give the yāḷ to Jīvakaṉ.

---

1. Kuṟaḷ; v. 1076, Pari.
2. Kali; v. 38:18.
3. Kali; v. 38:10-17.

"Eḻiṟṟakai mārpaṟku iṉyāḻ
Itu uyttu-k-koṭumō eṉṟāḷ"[1]

This literally means "you please give Jīvakaṉ, the beautiful and melodious yāḻ"—But Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar interprets the line as meaning "this melodious yāḻ is intended for Jīvakaṉ. But do not give it in the first instance. Give him many other yāḻs and finally this one". In this sense he splits this sentence as follows:

"Eḻiṟṟakai mārpaṟku iṉyāḻ itu
uyttu koṭumō."

'uyttu' is interpreted as meaning "give him, many other yāḻs" and "koṭumō" meaning 'give him' is in reference to the specific yāḻ. So, according to him, there are two objects for 'uyttu' and 'koṭumō' and this explanation has relevance. Not only he considers, two predicates for a single object are superfluous, but he bears in mind the succeeding context where, Jīvakaṉ's scholarship of the instrument is put to test. He is asked to examine several yāḻs before he finally settles on the right one.[2] Jīvakaṉ remarks, after selecting the right yāḻ, that it has all the best qualities evident in the lady.[3] So the very fact that Vīṇāpati in the story gives Jīvakaṉ many other yāḻs makes it clear that—uyttu-k- koṭumō has the implication as interpreted by Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar. It is not a voluntary action on the part of Vīṇāpati to have given many other yāḻs, but she carries out the order dictated by her mistress, Tattai, and this is evident by Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar's explanation.

2.9.2. *Cunantai nī avvai allai*

Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar has yet another way of splitting sentences. Jīvakaṉ is brought up by Cunantai. She renounces the world and becomes a saint. Jīvakaṉ is immersed in a world of grief. His own mother Vijaiyai had already renounced the world and Jīvakaṉ accepts it for granted, as she has not brought him up, but when he finds the foster mother, who so far showered all her affection on him, renouncing the world, he laments,

"Cuṭu tuyar eṉkaṇ ceytāy;
Cunantai nī avvai allai;
Koṭiyai nī koṭiya ceytāy"[4]

---

1. Jīvaka; v. 715.
2. Ibid; v. 716.
3. Jīvaka; v. 719.
4. Jīvaka; v. 2646.

It means "you have caused me great sorrow that burns me. So Cunantai! You are not my mother. You are now separated from me. So you are cruel". But Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar feels, this meaning will do great injustice to Jīvakan̲. To speak of a woman, who has brought him up, that she is not his mother, is unpardonable. So Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar gives a different meaning for the whole passage choosing and grouping the words as he pleased and he weaves a pattern of consistent interpretation, that, instead of doing injustice to his character, elevates him to a high pedestal.

"Cunantai nī avvai:
allai nī koṭiyai;
cuṭu tuyar en̲kaṇ ceytāy,
koṭiya ceytāy, koṭiyai nī"

Now it means, "Cunantai! because you brought me up you are my mother. So far you have not been cruel. But now you have decided to get separated from me. So you are very cruel". Here Jīvakan̲ worships Cunantai as his mother which describes his sense of gratitude. So when he finds fault with her for her separation, it only portrays his great affection for her and prompted by a feeling of righteous indignation provoked by her sudden action, he calls her cruel. He takes the liberty of calling her cruel, the liberty sanctioned by his excessive devotion for his mother.

2.10. *Humour*

In the literary works of great poets, humour lies very subtle, and it becomes the duty of the commentators to bring it out for the understanding of the readers. Sometimes, the annotator by his magic touch will make even an apparently dry passage replete with wit and humour.

2.10.1. *Rotating the hot mutton between the cheeks*

King Karikālan̲ entertains the musicians. The muscians who have been starving all these days without even a morsel of food, in their spontaneous enthusiasm and delight in having sighted food, a rich one at that, swallow everything they come accross. The mutton pieces suspended in an iron rod are very hot and when the musicians put them in their mouths, they feel the heat, but they do not want to spit them away, as they are very delicious, and excellently prepared. So with their mouths full of mutton pieces, which are very hot, they rotate them between the right and left cheeks to cool them and this

picture of their helplessness is graphically portrayed by Naccinārkkiniyar.[1]

2.10.2. *New man is really the old man*

The musician with his rags, and famished looks, has attracted the attention of many people by presenting a picture of abject misery and pain. The same day he is entertained at the palace as orderded by Karikālan and there happens a metamorphosis. The very realization he has reached the destination where poverty is banished, makes him swell with joy, and the incessant feeding effects such a physical change in him that he becomes entirely different the next day from what he was the previous day. He is in a state of semi-consciousness after having been entertained to a consistent flow of intoxicating drinks. His body is fragrant with the smell of many a flower, and so, bees are buzzing around his body. The people who have seen him the earlier day, are not able to recognise him now. They are surprised to see his physical stature now. Even the musician is not able to differentiate the present reality from a dream of his own. He presents himself before the king, and the king who has seen him earlier before the effects of feeding and drinking, is not able to recognise him and some of the servants by his side have to tell him that 'the new man' is really 'the old man' who had arrived the previous day in a state of penury and paid. This picture presents a humorous situation and Naccinārkkiniyar's commentary here is enjoyable.[2]

2.10.3. *Kingdom of rags*

The clothes of the musician in his famished state, are torn, and wet with perspiration. The rags have been stiched, and various kinds of different yarn have gone to stitch them to a shape. Also the lice and their eggs have claimed the kingdom of these rotten rags. Naccinārkkiniyar's interpretation of the phrase 'Iṟai kūṭi' as 'ruling over the kingdom' of rags, evidences his keen sense of humour.[3]

2.10.4. *The old buffalo*

In Kalittokai, the friend of the maiden goes to the place where the hero had said he would be waiting. But there she encounters an old Brahmin leper. He stands like an old buffalo near the hay stack- This passage itself is humourous. The old buffalo has reached such

---

1. Porunar; 11. 105-106.
2. Porunar; 11 96-102.
3. Porunar; 11. 78-81.

a stage that it cannot digest anything it eats. But it still has 'the residuary feelling', to eat, not in any way warranted by its physical ability to do so. The same way, the old man, by his disease and age, has reached the stage when it is physically impossible for him to do anything except keep alive. But 'the residuary feeling' of the senses is still there, and he looks at the girl in the same fashion as an old buffalo by the side of the hay stack. Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar makes the passage more humorous by interpreting the word 'Pakkattir̲ pōkātu' as meaning, "does not leave from that side 'though apparently this phrase would mean, "does not go to that side". Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar heightens the humorous situation by stationing the buffalo by the side of the hay stack, which by revealing its incapacity, solicits our sympathy for the bull and so also for the poor old Brahmin leper.[1]

2.10.5. *Satire: The swan and the conch*

There are two types of humour; (1) that which does not cause injury to others and (2) that which indirectly points out the follies of others. The latter is called satire. There is a beautiful scence in Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi. Calañcalam, the purest of conches, is grazing. The male swan, that comes there, mistakes the conch for its partner, and embraces it. It immediately realises its mistake and goes away. The poet describes the swan here as 'Aritu uṇar an̲n̲am', it means 'that which can discern the impossible'. Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar explains it still further: "The swan is traditionally known to discriminate water and milk and the swan gifted likewise, is not able to distinguish the partner from the conch."[2] There is a subtle suggestion of satire here.

2.10.6. *Smiling - 'Tān̲am'*

Pērāciriyar classifies humour into three kinds (1) smile, (2) laugh with restraint, (3) loud laughter.[3] In the literary works of great poets, humour lies only in making people smile. Jīvakan̲ after defeating the other kings, is about to marry Tattai. The defeated kings, instigated by Kaṭṭiyaṅkāran̲ declare war on Jīvakan̲. Jīvakan̲'s friend 'Patumukan̲' advises the foolish kings. This advice is classified by Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar as advice given in four ways, Cāmam, pētam, Tān̲am and Taṇṭam. One of his remarks runs like this ' even granting you are going to defeat us, Kaṭṭiyaṅkāran̲ will create hostility among you, and you will fight amongst yourselves and perish. This will leave Kaṭṭiyaṅkāran̲ open to claim all your kingdoms and he

1. Kali; v, 65.
2. Jīvaka; v. 2103.
3. Tol. Poruḷ. Pērā; s. 251.

will become the ruler. According to Naccinārkkiniyar this falls under Tānam. We are unable to understand this until Naccinārkkiniyar explains it still further. He says that since Patumukan has prevailed on them to understand the way of retaining their kingdoms instead of Kaṭṭiyaṅkaran claiming them all by fradulent means; in fact Patumukan has offered them their kingdoms, and thus this falls under the classification of 'Tānam'.[1]

2. 10. 7. *Tirunakar-c-celva*

There is another situation in Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi. The hunters claim the cattle of the shepherds of Rajamāpuram. Kaṭṭiyaṅkāran's sons, and Matan fight with the hunters and get defeated. The shepherds run to report this matter to the king Kaṭṭiyaṅkāran, and address him "Tiru nakar celva". It means "the leader of this beautiful city". Naccinārkkiniyar says that it implies that Kaṭṭiyaṅkāran is not the chief of the country, but has confined himself by this defeat to be the leader of that town only.[2] The suggestion that Kaṭṭiyaṅkāran is not able to hold his kingdom properly is apparently a satirical remark intended to go home.

1. Jīvaka; v. 755.
2. Jīvaka; v. 439.

CHAPTER—3

SIMILES AND METAPHORS

3.1. *Simile - Its Origin, Base, etc*

Simile is the basis of all figures of speech.[1] The poet employs this not only for clarification through comparison but also to heighten the beauty of a poem.[2] Metaphor and other figures of speech have their rudiment in simile only. The mind always engages itself in comparing or associating things, and this is the foundation of all the figures of speech. A thing or an incident is often compared with another thing or incident if they have basically similar traits. All the things in this world are connected with one another in some way or other. The vision of a poet sees such similarity everywhere. A poet has the ability to discover this unity among things - however small it may be.[3] "Normally people are engaged in finding out the diversity of things, and this is the thing that interests them to a great extent. Even things that have similarity with each other appear to them to be different from each other. But poets, find unity even in diverse things and this gives them delight. This delight is the basis of similes and metaphors".[4] Sometimes the poet is content with just making a reference to the similarity without explaining it still further and it is the duty of the annotator to bring it out for the proper understanding of the readers.

3.1.1. *The Origin of Simile*

A thing can be compared with another for various reasons. Tolkāppiyar says that similarity of (1) action. (2) effect, (3) form and (4) colour are the four origins of similes.[5] Naccinārkkiniyar, having in mind these ideas, explains various passages in literature wherever the reference is not obvious.

---

1. History of the Tamil Language: p. 49.
2. Tol. Poruḷ. Iḷam. Preface to Uvamaiyiyal; p. 395.
3. Ilakkiyakkalai; p. 170.
4. Ilakkiyattiran̲; pp. 228-9.
5. Tol. Poruḷ. Iḷam; s. 272.

In Maturai-k-kāñci there is a simile with reference to prostitutes:

"Nuṇ tātu uṇṭu varum pū tuṟakkum
Meṉ ciṟai vaṇṭiṉam māṉa"[1]

Here the prostitutes are compared to the bees. The two things in which the bees are occupied are also explained, to suck a flower and desert it. The poet has only suggested two ideas but there are things that follow by careful investigation of the passage. Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar analyses them. The bees engage themselves in:

1. knowing the time of a flower blossoming.
2. sucking its content (honey).
3. forgetting that flower.
4. deserting that flower.

Prostitutes can be compared to the bees, because of their four 'actions' mentioned below:

1. The prostitutes learn when a man gets wealth.
2. separate him from his riches.
3. forget him.
4. desert him.

So the simile of action is elaborately explained by Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar.

3.1.2. *Viravivarutal* (*Multiple simile*)

We saw earlier that two things can be compared with each other on account of only one of the following action, effect, form and colour. The bases for the simile in some place may be more than one of these. Such a simile may be called multiple simile.[2]

"Ulakam uvappa valaṉ ērputiritaru
Palar pukaḻ ñāyiṟu kaṭaṟ kaṇṭāṅku
Ovaṟa imaikkum cēṇ viḷaṅku avir oḷi"[3]

The sun rising from the sea is compared to Lord Murukaṉ over the peacock. Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar analyses all the reasons for such comparison and explains them one by one. The sun destroys darkness, so also Murukaṉ drives away 'Māyā'. Here there is the simile of action. The fresh blue colour of the sea, the glory of the rising red sun, all remind us of the beautiful colour pattern of the peacock

1. Maturai; 11. 573-574.
2. Tol. Poruḷ. Pērā; ss. 277.
3. Muruku; 1. 1-3.

and the complexion of Lord Murukan̲ and hence here is also the simile of colour. "The poets who are able to find out the unity in diversity, and commentators who are quick to find them and explain them still further are no doubt geniuses of the highest order".[1]

3.1.3. *Uvamai nilaikkaḷan̲ (The basis of simile)*

Tolkāppiyar has classified the main contexts or suggestions of similes as five and called them uvamai nilaikkaḷan̲ (The basis of simile).[2]

1. Cir̲appu. — expression of a feeling of greatness for the thing.
2. Nalan̲. — expression of feeling of quality i.e. beauty etc.
3. kātal. — expression of a feeling of love.
4. vali. — expression of a feeling of appreciation of the strength.
5. kil̲akkiṭu poruḷ — expressing a feeling of disgust at the meanness of the thing.

The later commentators have pointed out the similes occurring in poetry analysing the categories to which they belong.

In Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi Caccantan̲ is killed by his minister Kaṭṭiyaṅkāran̲. It is described thus: 'The sun-like king born of the sea-like - Kurukulam, is swallowed by the serpent-like Kaṭṭiyaṅkāran̲.[3] The king's greatness and the ingratitude of the villain Kāṭṭiyaṅkāran̲ are well portrayed here. The king belongs to a sea-like family tradition and it is his greatness. The minister is likened to a snake. The sea and the sun are all noble and great things whereas the snake is a mean one, and Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar points out the suggestions of these similes. The poet has employed these similes which express different tones and tenors, to use the phrasealogy of Richards, at the same place as revealed by the commentator.

3.1.4. *Comparison of various things to one thing specific*

In Kalittokai there occurs a line where the waist of a lady is compared to various things.

1. Ilakkiyakkalai; p. 9.
2. Tol. Poruḷ. Pērā; ss, 279-280.
3. Jīvaka; v. 290.

"Koṭi eṉa, miṉ eṉa
Aṇaṅku eṉa yātoṉṟum
Terikallā iṭai.[1]

The waist is compared to a creeper, lightning, and aṇaṅku ('harm). Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar analyses these similes and clarifies them. He says because of delicacy the waist is compared to a creeper, because of its flash of beauty to the lightning, because of its imperceptibility to something causing suffering.

3.1.5. *Comparison of several actions to a specific action*

The poet compares the merger of Kāvīry with the sea in the following way.

"Māmalai aṇainta koṇmū pōlavum
Tāy mulai taḻuviya kuḻavi pōlavum
Tēṟu nīr puṇariyōṭu āṟu talai maṇakkum"[2]

" Like the red cloud reaching a black mountain, and like the baby reaching for its mother's breast. the river Kāviry is merging with the sea ". Here the two actions of the river Kāviry are described in a beautiful manner by the commentator. One of them is: that keeping alive their respective identity Kāviry and the sea have merged together i.e. Kāviry retains its red colour and the sea its darkness. The second is seen at the next stage when the red colour merging with the black-sea-, disappears and becomes one with the colour of the sea, where the diversity becomes extinct, and unity becomes effective.. This is compared to the baby reaching for its mother's breast, when the unity bocomes absolute and complete.

3.2. *Some Kinds of Simile*

Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar, steeped well in Tolkāppiyam tradition, brings out the various similes in literature and classifies them. Also his experience as a literary commentator helps him feel aware of the new developments in the post Tolkāppiyam period, and his treatment of similes, as such, is a happy blend of the old and the new.

3.2.1. *Similes of Impossible*

In ancient Sangam classics, the poets never indulged in impossible conceits while they are common in literary works of the later age. " Immagination is that which conceives of an incident that happens

1. Kali ; v. 57 : 4-5.
2. Paṭṭiṉam ; ll. 95-97.

at one place and at a time, to have happened at a different place and time, and also it is capable of creating something which never exists or happens, which in fact, it is a poetic twist of a particular thing, that could have happened, in a different way".[1] This kind of twist is called, 'Ilporuḷ Uvamai', ('simile of the impossible'). But in Pattuppāṭṭu, there occurs a line

"... .... ciṟu kōṭṭu
Kuḷavi-t-tiṅkaḷ kōḷ nērntāṅku
Cuṟavu vāy amaitta curumpu cūḻ cuṭar nutal"[2]

The women are wearing a jewel called 'Makaravāy'. It is worn on the head and is suspended on the forehead. It is made of solid, pure gold. The way it hangs on the forehead looks like a golden snake opening its mouth, and as the forehead resembles a half moon, it appears as though the snake in the mythology is swallowing the moon. This is a reference to the Purāṇic belief of "Rahu devouring the moon" - But such eclipses occur only when the moon is full, and the snake, swallowing a half moon is an impossibility[3]. So Naccinārkkiniyar calls this simile of a non-existing event (Ilporuḷ uvamai). But the mythology being familiar to the reasons the poet is justifying such modifications so as to make clear the beautiful appearance of the adornments in the particular context reminding something of a heavenly beauty. There are many other references to the simile of the non-existing as mentioned by Naccinārkkiniyar.[4] But he has not mentioned some of the similes of this kind as belonging to this category.[5]

3.2.2 *Simile of Proverbs*

The poets also employ proverbs in the form of Simile. Such proverbs are common in the works of later poets more than in ancient poetry. Naccinārkkiniyar, in his commentaries, has investigated the origin of such proverbs and brought them to the understanding of the readers.

There is a proverb in Tamil "the tree felled by the cowherds".[6] The cowherds, to provide food for the cattle, cut the branches of the

1. Ilakkiyattiṟan ; p. 141.
2. Perumpāṇ ; 11. 383-585.
3. Nālaṭiyār; v. 241.
4. Jīvaka ; vv. 191, 195, 261, 275, 290, 502, 938, 1012, 1170, 1314, 1385, 1408, 1691, 1798, 2076, 2368, 2597, 2729, 3143 etc. Kali; vv. 7:8; 43:21.
5. Jīvaka ; vv. 1009, 1168, 2298.
6. Palamoḷi; v. 314.

trees in such a way that the branches hang half dead and half alive. Those suspended between pain and progress are often compared to this state. The poet employs this in Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi. When Jīvakan̲ discovers his mother, he laments: "I was born to bring about the ruin of kingdom, the misery of friends, and mother. But having been born like this, now I have reached the stage of the "tree felled by the cowherds"[1]. It means "I have no determination to die or to live, as the enemy Kaṭṭiyaṅkāran̲ is still alive". Jīvakan̲ is thinking of the plight of the tree with reference to his own uselessness. Even in ancient Sangam classics such similes are common as understood by the phrase "Oṭi er̲ital". Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar says it is the corrupted form of 'oṭiya er̲ital' which gives meaning according to the proverb under discussion.[2] There are also some other proverbs in the form of similes and Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar explains their origin in the same manner.[3]

3.2.3. *Cilēṭai* - (*pun*) - *uvamai*

The same word or sentence standing to mean more than one thing is called pun, or cilēṭai in Tamil. The simile also is exploited to a great extent in this word play. Only if this is consistent with the context, it can have a literary appeal; otherwise it will show only the verbal acrobatics of the poet. Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar mentions this 'pun' wherever it is employed and explains the significance in relation to the context were each one of them occurs.

Jīvakan̲ decides to leave Vimalai as he has business on hand. But he is not in a position to inform her of this separation as this would make her miserable. But finally he determines to break the news to her. It is described thus:

> 'Kāvin̲uḷ tōḻarai kaṇṭu pōtarvēn̲
> Evin̲uḷ tāḻcilai eyta kōlinē[4]

Jīvakan̲, who tells Vimalai, that he would return after seeing his friends, 'like an arrow shot by a weak bow'. The arrow would not go very far, but would return soon to the shooter. So also Jīvakan̲ makes Vimalai feel that he is not going very far, and will be returning soon. But it also means a different thing, which Jīvakan̲ has in his own mind only. The weak arrow may either return, or take a different direction, So also, Jīvakan̲ implies that he might go elsewhere. As a matter of fact he has not uttered a falsehood by this

1. Jīvaka; v. 1914.
2. Kali; v. 68:12.
3. Jīvaka; vv. 232, 455. 1920, 2003, 2072, etc.
4. Jīvaka ; 1993.

remark, and Vimalai also reconciles herself to the fact that the return of Jīvakaṉ is assured. But, the use of pun here creates a dramatic irony, as Jīvakaṉ and the readers only know what Jīvakaṉ has in his mind and this is well explained by Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar.

3.3. *Iraṭṭai Uvamai (Two fold similes)*

" Though simile can be employed by all the poets, the beauty of it increases with the greatness of a poet who brings many a point of similarity between a thing and its comparison. Even the attributes used in this connection attain importance and usefulness ".[1] The poet need not explain everything and it is for the commentator to elucidate the details.

3.3.1. *The thing and comparison with attributes*

When a thing is compared with another, sometimes both are described with epithets which are suggestive of further comparisons.

"Aṭai maṟai āyitaḻ pōtu pōl koṇṭa
Kuṭai niḻal tōṉṟum niṉ cemmal".[2]

Here the maiden friend of the lady love praises the son of the hero. He, under the shadow of an umbrella, is compared to the lotus flower under the green leaf. The green leaf and umbrella are epithets, but, Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar explains the similarity between the epithets also, and says, 'like the lotus flower under the green leaf, the son under the shadow of the green umbrella '.

Things compared	*Comparison*
Son	Lotus flower
Green umbrella	Green leaf

3.3.2. *The epithets of the upamāṉam applied to the upamēyam also*

In cases similar to the above, there are instances where the upamāṉam (comparison) occurs with an epithet whilst the upamēyam has no epithet. In Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi, there occurs an incident. A dog is hit by a Brahmin and it falls in a tank and is in its death pangs. Jīvakaṉ sees this, teaches the Pañca namaskāra mantram in its ears. Soon after, the dog leaves its body and reaches heaven as a Dēvā. The poet, in order to dispel the doubts of the people who are not convinced that a dog can become a dēvā, states that this happened even as a piece of iron when red-hot coming in contact with 'Rasa' (the philosopher's stone) achieves the colour of gold.

1. Ilakkiyakkalai; p. 178.
2. Kali; v. 84: 10-11.

"Kol ulai akattiṭṭu ūti
Kūr irumbu iratam kutta
Ellaiyil cempoṉ āki
Eri niṟam peṟṟataṉṟē"[1]

Here the iron has the attribute 'kūr'. All pieces of red hot iron, when they come into contact with 'Rasa', do not become gold; but only those which have the necessary conditions for becoming gold. Here 'kūr' (the attribute of the comparison) refers to such requisite perfection. So also, the dog has all the essential traits by birth to become Dēvā and this point is well-brought out by Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar's commentary.

Comparison	*Thing*
Iron	Dog
kūr (pre-requisites) for becoming gold	Pre-requisites (for becoming Dēvā)

3.3.3. *The attribute of the upamēyam applied to the upamāṉam*

Sometimes the upamēyam (the thing compared) has an attribute whereas the upamāṉam (the comparison) has none. The commentator explains the attribute properly and this heightens the beauty of the poem. In Pattppāṭṭu it occurs as follows:

"Paiṇkaṇ ūkam pāmpu piṭittaṉṉa
Aṅkōṭṭu-c-ceṟinta avilntu vīṅku tivavu"[2]

"The strings hold on to the vīnā base like a snake in the hands of a monkey". The attribute of action for the strings are 'avilntu' and 'vīṅku'—i.e. loosened here and fastened there. Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar brings out the points of similarity in asmuch as the 'snake' in the hands of a monkey twists around the limb of the monkey sometimes loosening and sometimes tightening.

3.3.4. *The attribute of the upamāṉam taken to upamēyam and the attribute of the upamēyam taken to upamāṉam in one and the same simile*

The poet in certain places would give a single attribute for each (upamāṉam and upamēyam) and the commentator would find a justification for both and bring out all the latent points of similarity in an elaborate way. We are amazed by the manner in which the poet condenses many ideas in a single attribute and thank the commentator for the extensive survey of the areas of similarity between the thing compared and the comparison.

---

1. Jīvaka; v. 960.
2. Ciṟupāṇ; 11. 221-222.

The fight between Mata<u>n</u>a<u>n</u> and Vijaya<u>n</u> is described in Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi. Mata<u>n</u>a<u>n</u> dies in the battle field. It is like the moon after driving away darkness being swallowed by the snake and getting immersed in the sea. Mata<u>n</u>a<u>n</u> fighting in the battle field, dashes against Vijay<u>n</u>'s elephant; ands killed by the latter's sword.[1] This can be explained thus:

Upamā<u>n</u>am *(comparison)*	Upamēyam *(thing compared)*
1. Moon	Mata<u>n</u>a<u>n</u>
2. driving away darkness	Putting to flight the enemies on the battle field
3.	Dashing against the elephant
4. Swallowed by the snake.	Dying at the point of the enemy's sword
5. Sinking in the sea	... ...

On the face of it there is nothing corresponding to the third aspect of upamēyam in the upamā<u>n</u>am and seemingly there is nothing corresponding to the 5th aspect of upamā<u>n</u>am in the upamēyam. One has to infer these missing aspects by the suggestive force of others. Here Nacci<u>n</u>ārkki<u>n</u>iyar explains thus: The moon going up in the sky is the comparison for dashing against the elephant and sinking in the sea is for going into the enemy's front. The stanza achieves clarity and beauty by this commentary.

3·4. *Inferred Similes*

Inferred similes are those in which either of the things, the comparison or the thing compared is mentioned and the other thing inferred. Similes in which the comparison is mentioned and the thing compared is understood, are known as Oṭṭaṇi in Pu<u>r</u>am and Uḷḷu<u>r</u>ai uvamam in Akam literature. As a matter of fact, this in a way heightens the beauty of the poem, as the reader is also activated to think and enjoy.

3.4.1. *Upamēyam inferred from upamā<u>n</u>am*

In some of the literary works we see that the comparison is understood. In Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi there is a poem:

"Tūmam ārnta<u>n</u>a tuppuravvukaḷ
Emam āyi<u>n</u>a ēnti ni<u>r</u><u>r</u>alāl

1. Jīvaka; v. 2245.

Nāma naṉṉagar naṉ poṉ kaṟpakam
Kāma valliyum kalam koṇṭiṭṭatē "[1]

Here the Kaṟpakam and Kāmavalli are comparisons, but it is not mentioned for which objects they stand as comparisons. The commentator makes it clear that the men and the women, who stand holding all these objects of fragrance and other things, are compared to Kaṟpakam and Kāmavalli respectively.

1.	Comparison	:	Kaṟpakam and Kāmavalli
2.	Things compared	:	Men and women (understood - brought out by the commentator)

3.4.2. *Upamāṉam inferred from upamēyam :*

In some poems the thing compared is mentioned and the comparison is understood. Jīvakaṉ is in Emamāpuram with Kaṉakamālai. His friends think of various designs to reach him. Then they decide to drive the cattle of the king away, which would necessarily bring Jivakan for the combat. The line that occurs here is,

"Porukku oḷi iṉa nirai kōṭum"[2]

According to Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar 'Porukku is a corrupion of 'Poruvukku' which means 'that equals'. Naturally the question is what 'equals' what? Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar here reminds us of a Mahābāratha story, when Duryōtaṉaṉ, suspicious of the movements of Dharma and his brothers, orders the driving away of the cattle of a king, where the Pāṇḍavās stay, and gets confirmed of his doubts. So 'that equals' refer to that incident in the opinion of Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar. Here the story is not specifically mentioned but there is only a very vague suggestion which Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar exploits to his advantage. It means that Mahābāratha stories should have been very popular in Tamilnad during the period of Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi. But 'Porukku' a corruption form of 'Poruvukku', if it means 'oppukku', can also imply a false excuse for action taken without any seriousness. This meaning is popular in the common parlance.[3] As the friends of Jīvakaṉ do not mean to fight with him, but as their intentions are only to reveal their identity, the word 'Porukku' could be taken to mean only oppukku (a false excuse for action). But the question is whether the meaning of oppukku was there in the age of Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi.

1 Jīvaka; v. 2404
2. Jīvaka; 1825.
3. Tamil Lexicon; Volume I. p. 595.

3.4.3. *Upamāṉam and upamēyam both inferred from context*

Rhetoricians speak of ekadesa uruvakam where some part of the event as upamēyam gets compared through rūpakam and some part has no comparison. Similar situation occurs in uvamai also. Sometimes the main part of the upamēyam itself is not mentioned but left to be understood.

In some of the stanzas both the thing compared and comparison are understood. Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar explains them clearly. In Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi Gōvindaṉ sets the target, a pig form which any prince succeeding to shoot sharp; will be able to get the hands of Ilakkaṇai. Many princes come and fail and they stand disheartened; some of them have come there only to watch this competition. At that time Jīvakāṉ comes there and aims an arrow to announce his arrival. The defeated princes are like blue lilies and those who came to which are like lotuses.[1] The poet has not explained how they equal these flowers. She commentator has explained them clearly. Jīvakaṉ is like the sun and 'the blue lilies', as is the tradition in Tamil poetry, fade out at the sight of the sun, and the lotuses blossom into fragrance at the sight. The significance of the similes is brought out well only if the simile, i.e. Jīvakaṉ looking like the sun, is justifiably explained. The ingenuity of the commentator in this connection is remarkable.

Comparison	*Thing compared*	*Similarity*	
1. Sun	Jīvakaṉ	Glamour	- brought out
2. Lilies	Defeated princes	fading	referred to in the
3. Lotuses	on lookers	blossoming	verse

3.5. *Similes of Suggestion*

In the same comparison, sometimes there might be two ideas, one patent and the other latent. The commentator by bringing out the latent idea, stresses both points of comparison.

3.5.1. *More ideas suggested by a simile*

Jīvakaṉ who leaves Kēmacari meets - somebody on the way and emphasises to the other Dharma, renunciation etc. He compares an ascetic to a snake that sheds its skin. The snake, while doing so, becomes pure. So also, a man must purify himself by renouncing desires.[2] Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar here suggests another point which is not

1. Jīvaka; 2199.
2. Jīvaka; v. 1546.

patent in the simile. A snake, while shedding its skin, spits out poison and according to Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar a man should cleanse himself of all subjective dirt, even while becoming outwardly pure to become an ascetic. The snake spitting out poison, as clearly pointed out by the commentator, broadens the meaning of this simile and heightens its beauty.

Many a king assembled at the court to enter the yāl̲ competition for winning the hand of Tattai. They are compared to the bees that buzz around a honeycomb. Here bees are the kings, the honey is Tattai, the desire for honey is the desire for Tattai.[1] So everything is clearly stated here, but Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar brings out another point that we least suspect, i.e. the honey being snatched away by a human being putting all the bees to grief. Here Jīvakan̲ wins the hand of Tattai, when all the kings are hoping against hope to win her hand. This is indeed an ingenious point.

'Valampuri' conch is considered to be the purest and the best of conches. Vijaiyai, like Valampuri conch yielding a pearl, brings forth Jīvakan̲[2] Both the thing compared and the comparison are made clear in the poem, but Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar brings out another point, which we would have normally missed in the poem i.e. the conch is traditionally known to die after yielding the pearl. So also Vijaiyai, after being delivered of Jīvakan̲ goes into temporary oblivion.

3.5.2. *Subtle points of similarity*

Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar by his commentary elucidates certain points that are not apparently there but conveyed by his keen intellect. Jīvakan̲'s ability in riding on an elephant is described by the poet.[3]

1. Like the flying of the morning sun on a mountain.
2. Like a dēvā on a running cloud.

In the first simile, Jīvakan̲ makes the elephant fly i.e. all the action is his at the first instant and in the second one, the elephant has learnt to move as directed by him i.e. the action is in that of the elephant. One describes the action of Jīvakan̲ and the other his physical form. As Jīvakan̲ ascends on the wild elephant, his action, in driving the elephant, is described by the first simile. As the elephant after being

---

1. Jīvaka; 615.
2. Jīvaka; 386.
3. Jīvaka ; v. 1838.

successfully tamed starts flying by itself without actually being forced by Jīvakan̲ after his initial control, it is described by the second simile. The two stages of movements are well brought out by these two similes as explained by the commentator.

1. Translation of his ability into dynamic activity

2. A fully controlled activity apparently static

3.5.3. *A striking point of similarity*

There may be some striking point of latent similarity between a thing compared and comparison, which once made clear become things of beauty. Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar gives us some instances of this nd of analysis of the simile.

Kaṭṭiyaṅkāran̲ attacks Caccantan̲. The king Caccantan̲ retaliates, provoked by the ingratitude of his minister. The poet describes the scene thus :

"Cīruṭai-k-kuricilum
Civantu aḷan̲r̲u ōr tittiraḷ
Pāruṭai-p-pan̲ikkaṭal
Cuṭuvatu ottu ulampin̲ān̲"[1]

"Caccantan̲, like the great fire at the end of the yuga, burning the seas retaliated" – this is the meaning of this poem. Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar brings out another point which we would have missed in our casual reading. The tradition has it that water came out of fire. So the forces which Kaṭṭiyaṅkāran̲ employs to attack Caccantan̲ are naturally the king's forces founded by him. But, now, he is forced to destroy his own forces as they attack him and so Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar says as water, created by fire, is destroyed by the same fire, Caccantan̲, who founded the army, attacks the same sea-like forces.

There is another point which we wish Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar had mentioned. It is true that water is created out of fire, but when the question of mutual combat comes water will finally extinguish fire. o also, the king's forces, founded by the same king, ultimately prevails over him and Kaṭṭiyaṅkāran̲ vanquishing him in the battle, ascends the throne. The meaning of the simile can thus be extended. It is amazing why Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar has not investigated the significance of this simile thus far, as we know him

1. Jīvaka ; v. 274.

to read the present incidents in the context of the future.[1] May be as the commentator has interpreted 'Fire' as the 'Great Fire' (at the end of the yuga) when water gets submerged in its origin, he has not extended the meaning of this simile.

3.6. *Making the dead similes alive*

A poet sometimes would refer to a character in the epic employing a comparison with reference to quality, action etc. The lion-like person, the elephant like prince etc. are the common usages, and they have become such a convention in epic poetry that no particular significance is attached to the similes as more or less they look like mechanical devices. But, for Naccinārkkiniyar, they are not mechanical but he would find some justifications for such usages bearing in mind the incidents to follow. He looks at the epic as an entity and does not annotate the poems as unconnected bits.

3.6.1. *Reference to what follows*

Caccantan̲ out of intense love for his queen forsakes the administration and decides to leave everything in the hands of his minister Kaṭṭiyaṅkāran̲. He summons Kaṭṭiyaṅkāran̲ and tells him of his decision. Here Caccantan̲ is referred to as Kaḷir̲an̲ān̲ (the elephant like person).[2] The simile apparently is conventional and does not show any purpose. But if we view at things that follow when Kaṭṭiyaṅkāran̲ is going to overthrow Caccantan̲ and capture the kingdom, the simile attains some significance and this is well brought out by Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar. Nimittikan̲ and Uruttiratattan̲, two other Ministers, advise Caccantan̲ against this decision but this falls on deaf ears as Caccantan̲ is bent upon handing over the reins of government to Kaṭṭiyaṅkāran̲ as he himself is after the pursuit of sensuous pleasures[3]. Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar states that as the elephant becoming a rogue elephant knocks down its driver, so also Caccantan̲ becoming a sensuous person tgnores the advice given by his two other ministers. This advice is to follow later. But Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar says that the poet has in mind this incident when he refers to the king as being elephant like in the poem. This justification is reasonable and gives us the whole picture.

---

1. Supra ; pp. 77 : 3.2.3., 85 : 3.5.1.
   Infra ; p. 88 : 3.6.1.
2. Jīvaka ; v. 200.
3. Jīvaka ; vv. 204-214.

3.6.2. *Reference to what precedes*

Naccinārkkiniyar puts himself in the place of the character and interprets their words and thereby reveals what there is in their subconscious even when they use similes and metaphors. Curamañcari and Kuṇamālai request Jīvakan to choose the better one of the 'cuṇṇam' they have prepared and his decision goes in favour of Kuṇamālai. Curamañcari takes a vow that she would make Jīvakan touch her feet (in'ūṭal' - anger feigned during nuptial nights). Here she refers to Jīvakan as "Maḷai vaḷḷal". (philanthropist like a cloud)[1] Usually in Tamil poetry, the philanthropist is compared to the cloud, as the latter showers rain to the world without expecting any return, and this simile has become a literary convention, generally referring to the heroes of poetry.[2] But here Naccinārkkiniyar finds a new significance in this usage. He interprets the line as meaning, 'one who does not have a proper discriminating sense'. This he says with reference to what has been working in the mind of Curamañcari regarding the judgement of Jīvakan in having chosen Kuṇamālai's cuṇṇam as the better one. Curamañcari feels that here is definitely better but Jīvakan's verdict has gone against her. So according to Naccinārkkiniyar she might be referring to Jīvakan who showers his munificent verdict but as one without the discriminating sense like the cloud. "The cloud does not choose where it should shower rains, and where it should not. The fields that require the rain most may go without it, and the dry land where nothing would grow may have plenty of rain"[3] This is the reason why Curamañcari compares Jīvakan with the cloud according to Naccinārkkiniyar.

3.7. *Different Suggestions for the same simile according to the Context*

A poet, who exploits the same simile at different places can be held to mean different things according to the context. The commentator, who has the point of view of the poet, does not fix the simile to mean one and the same thing in whichever context it may occur. He interprets it according to the place it appears and Naccinārkkiniyar reveals in this.

3.7.1. *The Sun*

The sun that rises in the morning over the sea attracted the attention of many poets, and Naccinārkkiniyar wherever it occurs,

1. Jīvaka ; v. 899.
2. Puṟam ; vv. 107, 397. Malai ; l. 580.
3. Puṟam ; v. 142.

refers to the action of the sun in dispelling darkness and its colour. But there occurs a line in Tirumurukāṟṟuppaṭai where Lord Muruka is likened to the sun. But here Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar investigates the matter still further and brings other points of similarity. It can be explained thus.[1]

Comparison	*The thing compared*
1. Sun	Lord Muruka
2. Rising over the sea	Rising high on the peacock
3. The greenish freshness of the sea	The greenish freshness of the peacock
4. The redness of the sun	The fair complexion of Muruka
5. Dispelling darkness	Dispelling 'Māyā'

Here the commentator shows his ingenuity in extending the scope of the simile and interprets it in a manner appropriate to the occasion or context.

In another place Toṇṭaimāṉ Iḷantiraiyaṉ is compared to the Sun. Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar finds different reason for this comparison. Like the Sun over the sea Iḷantiraiyaṉ shines amidst his kinsmen. As the sun removes darkness, he removes the wants of those who seek at his hand justice and wealth.[2]

In Malaipaṭu kaṭām, Naṉṉaṉ is compared to the Sun. Here Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar says that Naṉṉaṉ dispels the darrkness of hostility from without.[3] He gives the same interpretation at other places also.[4]

In yet another place, Jīvakaṉ is compared to the sun. Cutañcaṇaṉ, a Dēvā pays his respects to Jīvakaṉ. Cutañcaṇaṉ is likened to the moon and Jīvakaṉ to the sun. The moon does not have its own illumination, but it shines in the borrowed light of the sun, i.e. reflecting its glamour. Jīvakaṉ taught the Pañcanamaskāra mantram to Cutañcaṇaṉ during the time when he was about to die as a dog and so Cutañcaṇaṉ owes his existence as a Dēvā to Jīvakaṉ. Therefore the similes moon and sun are justified here.[5]

---

1. Muruku ; 11. 1-3.
2. Perumpaṇ ; 11. 441-447
3. Malai ; pp. 84-85.
4. Kali ; v. 100 : 1-2.
5. Jīvaka ; v. 953.

There are other places where Naccinārkkiniyar interprets in the same manner with reference to Moon, Kāmaṉ, Pāvai etc.[1]

3.7.2. *Similes with alternate suggestions*

Naccinārkkiniyar sometimes interprets the same simile in two ways and writes a critical appreciation. When the musicians return after getting plenty of presents from Naṉṉaṉ, it is described thus.

Mīmicai nal yāṟu kaṭal paṭarntāṅku
yām avaṇ niṉṟum varutum.[2]

(i) like the river descending from the mountain top, proceeds towards the sea, we (the musicians) starting from our house towards the place of Naṉṉaṉ and returning from him (with gifts).

	Comparisons	*The things compared*
1.	Mountain top	Musician's house
2.	River	Musicians
3.	Decending from the top	going from their house
4.	Sea	Naṉṉaṉ
5.	Proceeding towards the sea	to go to Naṉṉaṉ

This is one way of interpretation and the act of getting presents from him is not properly fixed in the simile - according to this interpretation.

(2) Like the river that carries the wealth of a mountain and flows towards the sea, we (the musicians) are returning from Naṉṉaṉ's home after receiving innumerable gifts from him.

	Comparisons	*The things compared*
1.	Mountain top	Naṉṉaṉ's place
2.	Mountain's wealth	Naṉṉaṉ's wealth
3.	River	Musicians
4.	Sea	Musician's house

1. Moon.—Muruku ; ll. 96-98 ; Ciṟupāṇ ; ll. 219-220. Jivaka ; vv. 362, 380, 454, 603, 1409.
   Kāmaṉ :—Kali ; v. 143, 33-35. Jīvaka ; vv. 607, 664, 674, 2038, 2282, 2730, etc.
   Pāvai :—Kali ; v. 22:56, Jīvaka : vv. 197, 1573, 2542, 2651.
2. Malai ; ll. 52-53.

5. The river carrying the wealth of the Mountain flows towards the sea.	The musicians carrying the wealth of Naṉṉaṉ return home

Though Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar does not say so, the second interpretation is more natural and describes the true spirit of the poem. In the first interpretation, there is no comparison for the musicians returning from Naṉṉaṉ with gifts. Also it is unnecessary to describe the musician's starting from their home to reach the palace of Naṉṉaṉ and involve a comparison for it as it is understood.

3-7.3. *Refusing to read a simile*

There are places where Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar also points out the interpretation of other commentators where they read a simile therein The lust of the prostitutes is described by the poet as.

"Uppu amai kāma-t-tuppu"[1]

Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar does not hold 'amai' as the sign of simile, but he interprets it in the negative sense i.e. 'without'. He interprets lust that does not turn sour or stale. He gives the interpretation of other commentator also (i.e.) "the salt is used in measure according to the quantity of a thing to give taste to it. So also these women give pleasures according to the wealth they receive."

3.8. *An Assessment of Some Interpretations*

Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar is conscious of the fact that he is a grammarian first and commentator next and as such, interprets certain lines within the boundary of grammar that sometimes does little justice to the beauty of the poem, but at places where he finds that a grammatical interpretation will be in conflict with the cherished culture of the country, he forsakes grammar and lays importance on culture.

3.8.1. *Interpretations of similes on the basis of culture*

We saw earlier how Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar interprets certain passages that are obviously in conflict with our ideals of culture in a way that lifts them out of such shortcomings. This can be seen even in his interpretation of similes. The women who had renounced earlier dress up Vijaiyai and Cunantai for the act of renunciation. They pass round their breasts a white cloth and tie them up and this is described by the poet.

---

1. Jīvaka : v. 107.

"Pāli<u>n</u>āl cī<u>r</u>aṭi kaḻuvip-paintukil
Nūli<u>n</u>āl iya<u>nr</u>a<u>n</u>a nu<u>n</u>itta nuṇmaiya
Kāla<u>n</u>ai-k-kaṇ putaittāṅku vemmulai
Mēlvaḷāi vīkki<u>n</u>ār vitiyi<u>n</u> e<u>n</u>pavē"[1]

As the eyes of Yama are tied up, their breasts are tightly concealed by the white clothes. This is the direct meaning of this passage. But here the meaning is repulsive and against the spirit of the context. To talk of the breasts of old women, and in such context when they are to renounce the world, is far from being appropriate and it is evident if this is the meaning, this is one of the crudest pictures in the epic. Nacci<u>n</u>ārkki<u>n</u>iyar offers an interpretation which removes our feeling of revulsion.

The women already renounced covered the breasts of Vijaiyai and Cunantai, which in their early days of youth, by torturing young men by the irteasing shape and form, made the occupation of Yama pāle into insignificance. Here according to Nacci<u>n</u>ārkki<u>n</u>iyar this 'āṅk<u>n</u>'' (kāla<u>n</u>ai kaṇ putaitt-āṅku) is not the sign of comparison referring to the simile of action, but indicates the previous history of their breasts. Though it might violate the rules of Tolkāppiyar who prescribes 'āṅku' as a symbol for the simile of action,[2] here Nacci<u>n</u>ārkki<u>n</u>iyar interprets 'āṅku' as a symbol for the simile of a noun and offers explanation this way, only to save the poem from a crude and unwarranted imagery. Even this refinery work does not save the poem from being crude, but it is evidence of the commentator's ingenuity and his literary consciousness based on a solid foundation of culture and refinement.

3.8.2. *Prosaic interpretation of similes*

When a thing is compared with another, normally the comparison will be of a higher degree than the other.[3] Leaping is a common trait between a tiger and a cat, but it is usual to say he leaped like a tiger and not like a cat.[4] So it is likely the comparison tends to exaggerate the particular aspect of the thing compared. There are instances where the comparison and the thing compared are described as of equal status or degree. In Ci<u>r</u>upāṇā<u>rr</u>uppaṭai the poet describes the beauty of the wife of Pāṇa<u>n</u> thus :

---

1. Jīvaka ; v. 2634.
2. Tol. Poruḷ. Pērā ; s. 287.
3. Tol. Poruḷ. Pērā ; s. 278.
4. Tol. Poruḷ. Pērā; s. 283.

"Īrntu nilam tōyum irum piṭi-t-taṭakkaiyiṉ
Cērntuṭaṉ ceṟinta kuṟaṅkiṉ kuṟankeṉa
Mālvarai oḷukiya vāḻai vālai-p
pūveṉa-p-polinta ōti"[1]

It means that the thigh of the lady is as firm and well shaped as the trunk of an elephant, the banana tree in the mountain side is as shapely and rich in complexion as the thigh of the lady. The pig tail of the lady is as delicate and fragrant as the flower of the banana tree.

Here the poet without any discrimination alternates the thing compared and comparison in such a way that both of them heighten the beauty of the poem to a great extent. There is free mixing up of the natural and the artificial—and the artificial is elevated to the status of natural. For the poet, both of them appear beautiful, and it is not possible—for him to choose one from the other and hence the comparison of the thing compared are alternated, in such a telling fashion. Pērāciriyar explains such passages in the same manner as they occur, the natural alternating with the artificial.[2]

But Naccinārkkiniyar holds a different view. According to him perhaps such alternation are confusing and so he annotates the passage—of course, without offending the grammar of simile, in his opinion in such a prosaic way, that it robs the poem of its beauty and charm. He interprets it thus: 'the thigh as thick as the trunk of an elephant, and also as rich in firmness as a banana tree—so he contends both the trunk and banana tree are comparisons. This is an offense to the aesthetic sense of the poet as well as that of the discriminating reader.

3.9. *Metaphor—its Origin Base Etc*

"The origin of the simile is to explain the unknown comparing it with the known. But later on the poet immersed in the beauty of such comparisons, exploited the similes to heighten the beauty of a poem".[1] "Comparing the beauty of one thing with the beauty of another is simile. There are four parts in the simile. "Pearl like beautiful teeth"—Here 'pearl' is upamanam (the comparison), 'teeth' upameyam (the thing compared); 'like' is the sign of comparison and 'beauty' is the point of comparison. The poet, immersed in the beauty

1. Ciṟupāṇ; 11. 19-31
2. Ibid; s. 311, p. 179.
3. Tol. Poruḷ. Iḷam, Preface to Uvamaiyiyal; p. 395.

of the simile, is likely to omit mentioning the sign of comparison and the common aspect and say 'pearl teeth'. This is classified as 'uvamattokai' in Tamil grammar (where the sign is latent).[1] 'Pearl teeth' is a better way of putting than 'pearl like beautiful teeth'; and shows the keen sense of beauty of the poet. In 'pearl like beautiful teeth' the sense of comparison is more emphasised than the description itself. In 'pearl teeth' the feeling of oneness (pearl and teeth) increases. This gives room to metaphor where we say 'teeth-pearl' the sense of discrimination between them is increasingly diminished to give way to the feeling of oneness and when we refer to the teeth as 'pearl' this is complete and this is the origin of metaphor."[2] "Metaphor is nothing but compressed simile".[3] According to thisr origin it may be described thus :

1. Pearl-like beautiful teeth.
2. Pearl like teeth.
3. Pearl teeth.
4. Teeth-pearl.
5. Pearl.

3.9.1. *The distinction between metaphor and simile*

It is very difficult to determine the boundary between the simile and metaphor. As the upamāṉam and upamēyam merge with each other, metaphor takes its birth in this unity. Tolkāppiyar, therefore considers metaphor as one of the aspects of similes.[4] 'Pearl-like beautiful teeth' and 'pearl-like teeth' are patent forms of similes. In the first stage we know pearl and teeth are two different things considered for comparison because of the common aspect of beauty. In the next stage, as we say, 'pearl-like teeth' the beauty is taken for granted, and understood. The last two stages, as we say, 'teeth pearl' and 'pearl' are patent forms of metaphor because they are not in the area of simile. There can be no doubt that these two teeth—pearl and pearl are metaphors as there is clear attribution of unity of ārōpam.

But the third and the middle stage "Pearl-teeth" is a difficult one to be determined whether it is simile or metaphor, or rather it shows the evolutionary stage between simile and metaphor, where metaphor becomes more predominant than simile.[5] The vital link

1. Tol. Poruḷ. Pēra; s. 282. Foot note. p. 126.
2. Ilakkiyakkalai; p. 197.
3. Poetry and the Ordinary Reader; p. 64.
4. Tol. Poruḷ. Iḷam; s. 280, p. 401.
5. Ilakkiyattiṟaṉ; p. 231.

between the thing compared and comparison 'the sign of comparison' or 'uvama urupu' as it vanishes it effects this change. Here, in 'pearl -teeth', the feeling of two different things decreases, as more and more we associate the pearl with the teeth.

There is a passage in Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi, where the battle field is likened to the mirror.

"Āṭavar āṇmai tōṟṟum
Aṇi kiḷar pavaḷa-t-tiṇ kai
Nīṭeri nilai-k-kaṇṇāṭi-p-pōrkkaḷam"[1]

'Mirror-battle-field'-this is how it is described here. It is something like saying 'pearl-teeth'-Naccinārkkiniyar interprets this as "the battle-field that is a mirror". He explains it further, 'as the mirror reflects beauty and ugliness alike, the battle-field is the ground where valour and cowardice both appear' and contends this is the reason for the comparison. First he refers to this as metaphor and later concludes this is a simile. It is clear he is not clear about this point. This shows that the border line of distinction between metaphor and simile is very thin, vague and ambiguous and the fact that it has landed such a commentator as Naccinārkkiniyar in confusion, strengthens this point of view.

3.9.2. *The usage of metaphor and the duty of the commentator*

The poet makes use of metaphor as and when he wants to emphasise a point with telling effect and the commentator has to engage himself in bringing out the points of comparison i.e. he has to dissolve the metaphor and bring out all the five things as stated earlier, as a mechanic dissemble the component parts of a motor-car. This needs great skill and the commentator is required to be of the calibre of the poet in doing his duty. The commentator first reduces the metaphor into a simile, carefully progressing through all the five stages and then investigates the simile in the same manner as mentioned in the chapter on Simile.

3.9.3. *Metaphor—(Nouns)*

In Tirumurukāṟṟuppaṭai, Lord Muruka is described thus.

"Palar pukaḻ naṉmoḻi-p-pulavar ēṟē"[2]

Here 'Pulavar ēṟē' is a metaphor. 'Ēṟu' means 'lion'. Suppose the poet has said 'lion like Muruka'—it will be a simile. But here it

1. Jīvaka; v. 2299.
2. Muruku; 1. 268.

means the lion to the poets. Here the 'poets' are not explicitly compared to anything, but Naccinārkkiniyar brings out the comparison taking it as an ēkatēsa uruvakam to make this metaphor more effective and beautiful. He interprets,

"the lion to the elephant-like poets"

The poets are intellectually arrogant, like haughty elephants and the lion-like Muruka puts them in their place. So this lion is not meaningless poetic jargon, but attains significance only when the comparison for the "poets" is investigated and brought out. But it has to be remarked that though one must feel thankful for this explanation, a metaphor through a simile can never kindle the same feeling and emotion as a metaphor.

3.9.4. *Ekatēsa uruvakam* (*Partial metaphor*)

The poet sometimes employs an action metaphor from which the rest of the ideas implied, are understood. The commentator draws the latent points from this metaphor after dissolving the whole picture in an explicit manner. Jīvakan̲ wins the hand of Tattai after defeating the other kings who have assembled there at the yāḻ competition. The kings declare war against him and before that, issue a warning to him without being aware of his prowess. They say : "you are being in the merchant community and you are not in the know of things regarding what makes a good merchant. If an acquisition of gains involve risks for the capital, a good merchant will forsake the gains and take care of his capital".

"Cēṇikantu uyyappō nin̲ ceṟi toṭi oḷiya en̲ṟār"[1] Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar explains this metaphor in an ingenious way. He interprets that they tell Jīvakan̲ to forsake Tattai (gains) and take care of his life (capital). A good merchant takes his capital elsewhere to find a decent living and he would not be ready to loss the capital also in the pursuit of profits. This is because the poet speaks of Vāṇikam or trade. His coming to swayamvaram is explained in terms of it. But Tattai, Jīvakan̲ etc., are not correspondingly made metaphors. But by the suggestive force of the whole event as vāṇikam, the parts of it can be interpreted in terms of a metaphor as is here done by Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar. This kind of partial metaphor is called ēkatēsa uruvkam by rhetoricians.

The poet thus mixes up the comparison and the things compared alternating them in a series in a full picture of Metaphor. The commentator after a careful investigation, fills up the gaps in the picture as a complete metaphor.

1. Jīvakva. 770.

The heroine who pines away in grief prays to the sun, "Oh Sun, you know the place where my hero has gone. You please search for him and give him back to me. If I get him back, 'the fire', that burns my life which is like a wick in a lamp getting burnt, will leave". The lines are as under :

> Tarukuvai āyiṉ tavirum eṉ neñcattu
> uyir tiriyā māṭṭiya tī[1]

As it is it can be presented thus :

The things	Metaphor
1. Heart	... ...
2. Life	wick in a lamp
3.	burning away
4.	fire
5. To leave	....

Here the picture of "life as the wick in a lamp" alone is given. There is no equivalent metaphors given for the noun 'heart' and the verb "to leave". Burning away and fire are two metaphors but for which the things that are compared are not given. Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar fills up these gaps and gives us the complete picture. "In the lamp of my heart, the feeling of separation for my hero which burns me like 'fire' will be put out". It can be described thus :

The things	Metaphor
1. Heart	lamp
2. Life	wick in the lamp
3. Pain	burning
4. The feeling of separation	fire
5. To leave	to be put out

3.9.5. *Metaphor—Verbs*

Metaphor can be indicated not only by the nouns but by the verbs as well. "When it is said, 'Maṉam iruṇṭatu' is 'the mind got darkened', it carries an emotional significance—like the sky getting dark. so also, the mind, loosing hope, is darkened by worries. The word 'darkened' is replete with such metaphorical possibilities".[2] The alaṅkārikās call it 'Camāti'.[3] Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar analyses such verbs and gives us the whole picture of a metaphor and we come to know

1. Kali; v. 142; 39-40.
2. Ilakkiyattiṟaṉ; p. 231.
3. Taṇṭi Alaṅkāram; pp. 26-27.

that a verb indicates all these things. There occurs a line in Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi.

> "Tōkaiyan tukiliṉāḷ taṉ
> Tuṇai mulai porutu cēnta".[1]

"The breasts of Ilakkaṇai fought and became red"—this is the meaning of the line. Here 'fought' the verb is a metaphor. The question arises against whom the breasts 'fought' and what exactly is meant by this metaphorical predicate. Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar analyses this word and creates a conceit of his own. The breasts are usually compared to the elephants, and elephant force is traditionally known to be the best in these four kinds of forces (chariots, elephants, horses, soldiers). That the elephants fought, is obvious but against whom is the question. Jīvakaṉ's broad chest is usually symbolised as a mountain. Therefore, the elephants have to be taken to have dashed against this mountain to prove their strength—That is "the breasts (elephants) of —Ilakkaṇai, in a violent embrace with Jīvakaṉ are pictured as fighting against his chest of a mountain"—and they are supposed to be still in a state of anger in her hankering for his embrace and hence their redness (anger). So a particular verb charged with metaphorical possibilities makes the commentator give us a complete picture.

3.9.6. *Clarification of points of similarity*

When a thing is compared with another, and it becomes metaphor, the poet has in mind some basic similarities and features in both. We need not expect him to give us the points of similarity. The commentator offers the explanation.

Jīvakaṉ was taught the essential values of life by his teacher. Accaṇanti, stands in the path of virtue worshipping the feet of the Jain God (Aruka). This is symbolised by the poet thus :

The bliss (Kāṭci) is pictured as the gate, knowledge (ñaṉam) as door and good conduct (Oḷukkam) as the bolt.[2]

Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar analyses why these metaphors have been used. The gate is permanent, so also Bliss (kāṭci), knowledge as the door gives the protection and good conduct like the bolt is inseparable from Bliss and good Conduct. There are many other places in Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi, where Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar, after a skilful investigation points out the similarities between things and metaphors.[3]

---

1. Jīvaka; v. 2477.
2. Jīvaka; v. 381.
3. Jīvaka; vv. 843, 845, 2848, 2860, 3081, etc.

3.9.7. *Metaphor on the basis of the ideal*

Curamañcari falls in love with Jīvakaṉ and she tells her friend about this, and the poet gives a beautiful description of this theme. "She with her garland of chastity tries to drive away the bee of modesty.[1] The shedding of modesty has been described in other works also.[2] But Naccinārkkiniyar is not able to reconcile himself to the idea of women forsaking modesty absolutely. For women, modesty is more valuable than life and chastity is more valuable than modesty.[3] So he says as Curamañcari drives away the bee of modesty with the garland of chastity, the bee has not completely left her ; as the fragrance of the garland itself draws it more and more to her proximity. So Naccinārkkiniyar contends that Curamañcari is not completely devoid of modesty.

1. Jīvaka; v. 2073.
2. Iṟaiyaṉār; s. 23, pp. 137-138, s. 29, p. 157.
3. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 113.

Chapter — 4

SYNONYMY AND POLYSEMY

4.1. *Synonyms*

4.1.1. *Synonyms - not repetitions*

A poem should be brief with every word in direct relation to the thing it portrays, or the emotion it conveys. Unnecessary words or repetitions only dilute the poetic essence. As a matter of fact, the grammarians have enumerated short-comings that should be avoided, such as exaggerations, emptiness, and uselessness.[1] But when a great poet employing two or more synonyms in a poem, he should have done it for a specific purpose and not for a mere repetition of the idea. It becomes the duty of the commentator to find out this purpose. Naccinārkkiniyar often brings out of the subtle nuances of meaning differentiating apparent synonyms.

4.1.2. *Synonyms—not substitutes*

What at first look like synonyms are found to de different on a closer examination. Some authors go to the extent of denying the very existence of synonyms. 'Pōtu' and 'malar' mean flower in later usage. But they refer literally and strictly to different stages of the flower. Even as 'arumpu' refers to the earliest stage, pōtu refers to a stage when the flower is on the verge of blossoming, and 'malar' to the stage when the flower has blossomed. Therefore one of them cannot be substituted for the other. The difference is well brought out by Tiruvaḷḷuvar in one of his couplets.

"Kālai arumpi-p-pakal ellām pōtāki
mālai malarumin nōy"

which describes the various stages of love.[2]

4. 1. 3. *Methods of interpreting synonyms*

The methods adopted by Naccinārkkiniyar to explain the synonymy or polysemy may be classified under two main divisions.

---

1. Tol. Poruḷ. Pērā; s. 663.
2. Kuraḷ; v. 1227.

1. Differentiation.
2. Non-differentiation.

Differentiation can be explained under four heads as follows :-

1. Different but allied meanings.
2. Different meanings but not allied.
3. Avoidance of repetition of meaning by taking the sentence as elliptical.
4. Dislodgement of synonymous words or poetic inversion.

4.2. *Different but allied meanings*

In a poem, wherever there are nouns of quality apparently synonyms, Naccinārkkiniyar distinguishes them to prove they are not empty repetitions.

4.2.1. *Paṇpu-p-peyar* (*nouns of quality*)

(1) *The synonyms of beauty* employed in the literary works are aḻaku, aṇi, āy, eḻil, ēr, kavin, kōlam, takai, nalam, vanam, vanappu etc. The beauty of the Divine ladies on the mountain is described by Nakkīrar thus :

"kai punaintiyarrā-k-kavin peru vanappu"[1]

Naccinārkkiniyar explains 'vanappu' as the natural beauty as against 'kavin' i.e. the artificial by beautifying one's appearance so as to heighten their native charm. Here he distinguishes the words 'kavin' and 'vanappu'. Kavin according to him is made up beauty, whereas 'vanappu' is natural beauty. In Kalittokai, the heroine after her separation from the hero is described as losing here kavin.[2] It means here, she has no artificial make up or beauty or adornment. There is another line "āy nutal aṇi kūntal"[3] - Naccinārkkiniyar explains the line as referring to the beautiful forehead and beautified hairlocks. 'Āy according to him is natural beauty and 'aṇi' is artificial. There are various instances where Naccinārkkiniyar brings out such subtle nuances of meaning as may be seen from what follows.

1. Muruku; l. 17.
2. Kali; v. 45:19.
3. Kali; v. 40:8.

a.	Kavin̲	—	made up beauty
	van̲appu	—	natural charm[1]
b.	el̤il	—	growing beauty
	kavin̲	—	beauty[2]
c.	ēr	—	growing beauty
	van̲am	—	beauty[3]
d.	el̤il	—	beauty of the various parts of the body
	van̲appu	—	beauty of the appearance[4]
e.	aṇi	—	beauty
	ēr	—	growing beauty[5]
f.	āy	—	natural charm
	aṇi	—	beautified[6]
g.	ton̲n̲alam	—	natural beauty (because of the preceding word tol)
	aṇivan̲appu	—	artificial beauty (because of the preceding word aṇi[7])
h.	pun̲ai nalam	—	artificial beauty (because of the preceding word pun̲ai)
	al̤aku	—	natural charm[8]
i.	nalam	—	beauty of the various parts of the body
	kavin̲	—	total personality[9]
j.	al̤aku	—	personality
	kōlam	—	the beautiful pattern of adornment etc[10]
k.	el̤il	—	artificial beauty[11]

1. Muruku; l. 17.
2. Kali; v. 45:19.
3. Porunar; l. 35.
4. Kali; v. 17:13-14.
5. Jīvaka; v. 2100.
6. Kali; v. 40:8.
7. Ibid; v. 124:11-12.
8. Jīvaka; v. 1108.
9. Ibid; v. 1357.
10. Jīvaka; v. 2839.
11. Malai; l. 57.

So it is clear that the words aḻaku, vaṉappu, āy, and nalam pertain to natural beauty. Alaku denotes the personality; vaṉappu beauty of appearance; āy, the beauty of the individual parts of the body; nalam, the beauty of the limbs; - these are subtle variations Aḻaku, vaṉappu, nalam are words of quality. Āy occurs as an attribute for the noun of quality. Aḻaku, nalam vaṉappu with attributes denote the artificial beauty also. For instances - Puṉainalam, aṇivaṉappu, Kaviṉ, aṅi, kōlam denote artificial beauty. Ēr perhaps refers to the growing charm of the body and 'Eḻil' to the grace one develops after consummation and this we can make but from Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar's commentary.[1] Vaṉam looks like the root of the word vaṉappu, hence it has the same meaning as vaṉappu. There are a few more nouns of quality contrasted by Nācciṉārkiṉiyar as under.

(2) There are two words in Tamil denoting stage of being young. Kuḷavi and Iḷam.

"Kuḷavi-k-kōṭṭu iḷam piṟai"[2]

Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar interprets this as the moon born after the new-moon day (childhood) evolving gradually into youth. Here kulavi, according to him is infancy and Iḷam refers to a later stage of childhood.

(3) "*Iṉṟīṅkiḻaviyāy*" is a line occuring in 'Kalittokai'.[3] Here two words denoting sweetness, occur 'iṉ' and 'tīm'. According to Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar they mean :

a. Iṉkiḷavi — sweet after it is heard i.e. because of its effect

b. Tīmkiḷavi — sweet at the time of hearing itself

(4) a. kōpam — anger that vanishes just after its occurance

b. Ciṉam — anger that stays a little while and then vanishes[4]

1. Kali, vv. 17:13-14; 45:19. Porunar; 1. 35
2. Jīvaka; v. 165.
3. Kali; v. 24;3.
4. Muruku; 11. 134-135. Ciṟupāṉ; 1. 210.

(5) a. Ikal — temporary hostility
b. Ceṟṟam — long-standing hostility[1]

(6) a. Varuttam — Physical misery
b. Iṭumpai — mental misery
c. Aṉar — mental misery
d. Tuṉi — to dislike
e. Evvam — misery
f. Tuyar — poverty
g. vāṭṭam — physical exhaustion
h. parivu — Mental exhaustion[2]

(7) a. Paru — Stout
b. Eṟuḻ — Strength
c. Tiṇi — tight and not loose (muscles etc.)
d. Muṭalai — hard and well twisted
e. vali — physical strength
f. Āṇmai — masculine strength[3]

(8) a. Veṟṟi — victory in war
b. Viṟal — triumph over senses[4]

(9) a. Uyir — sound
b. Viḷi — the word conveyed by the sound[5]

Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar has not conveyed the meaning of 'oli' and 'kural' But it occurs as :

"uyar kural oli ōṭi"[6]

---

1. Muruku; 11. 131-133.
2. Ibid; 11. 135-136.
   Porunar; 11. 87-88.
   Ciṟupāṉ; 1. 39.
   Jīvaka; v. 2382.
3. Netu-1; 11.31-32. Jīvaka; v. 1165.
4. Malai; 1. 544.
5. Kuṟinci; 1. 108.
6. Kali; v. 45:5.

'Uyar kural' is the high pitch. 'Oli' because of the verb 'ōṭi', shows a loud sound.

(10) *Paṟṟu, ārvam, kātal, kaḷippu, kāmam* all these words denote desire. Naccinārkkiniyar finds fine distinctions amongst all these words.

a.	Paṟṟu	—	attachment to the acquired object
b.	Ārvam	—	a want or hankering after the unacquired object[1]
b.	kātal	—	love for the beauty of the woman.
	kāmam	—	the range for immidiate satisfaction of lust.[2]

(11) *Inmai* means that which is not. There are three words which denote this : Tolaital, illāmai and iṭaṉ illāmai. Kalittokai describes the poverty in this way and Naccinārkki ṉiyar distinguishes all these words.

a.	Tolaivu	—	implies an earlier prosperous stage which has later disappeared leaving one in poverty.
b.	Inmai	—	implies no such change but a continuous poverty.
c.	Iṭam inmai	—	implies not absolute poverty but the state when one is not in a position to maintain his family completely.[3]

Tolkāppiyar refers to the words ī, tā and koṭu as asking for a thing.[4] Naccinārkkiniyar says that they denote giving wealth to the three kinds of people stated earlier.

4.2.2. *Nouns other than paṇpu*

So far had been described the different meanings of words based on the different force of the roots. But there are other words which have become synonymous in a later age which has forgotten the differentiations recognised by an earlier generation which made use of

1. Jīvaka; vv. 946, 3039, 3105.
2. Ibid; vv. 1596, 1633.
3. Kali; v. 2:11, 15, 19.
4. Tol. Col; ss. 444-448.

these distinctions in every day speech. Here the commentator understanding the earlier usage, makes clear the distinctions. Most of these are other than paṇpu-p-peyar already mentioned.

(1) *Malar and mālai* : There are various words in Tamil referring to malar (flower) as already stated. There is a line in Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi.

"Paim pōtu alar cinti"[1]

Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar explains—honey drops from pōtu and alar, there by implying that the two are different words. Pōtu has been already explained as the flower in bloom, whilst alar has to be equated with malar as a blossomed flower.

The different meanings for the apparently similar words referring to 'mālai' (garland) are as under :

a.	Kōtai	—	the garland on the forehead of women[2]
b.	Tār	—	the garland the men wear on the chest[3]
c.	Mālai	—	the garland on the head or the forehead often as symbol[4]
d.	Kāḻ	—	one string of flowers as against many string of flowers etc[5]
e.	Kaṇṇi	—	a big garland made up of several strings of flowers worn on the head[6]
f.	Piṇaiyal	—	a cluster of flowers made into a garland, worn on the chest[7]
g.	cūṭṭu	—	a string of flowers worn on the forehead[8]
h.	Āram	—	garland of pearls[9]

1. Jīvaka; v. 1228.
2. Maturai; 11. 264-266.
3. Ibid; Jivaka; vv. 979, 2119, 3022.
4. Jīvaka; v. 979, 3022.
5. Kali; v. 115:5.
6. Kali; v. 115:5 Jīvaka; v. 193.
7. Jīvaka; v. 193.
8. Ibid.
9. Kali; v. 135; 18.

(2) *Nouns of Places* : The differences between various nouns of places, according to Naccinārkkiniyar are as under :

a.	Kōṇam	—	narrow street
	Maruku	—	broad street[1]
b.	Vāyil	—	big entrance (gate)
	Puḻai	—	smaller entrance (gate)[2]
c.	Araṅkam	—	a place where dramas are staged
	Ampalam	—	a place where many witness he plays[3]

(3) *Nouns mountain* : The difference amongst nouns referring to mountains according to Naccinārkkiniyar are as under :

a,	Veṟpu	—	big mountain.[4]
b.	Malai	—	small hill[5]
c.	Varai	—	small hill or the top of the hill[6]
d.	Aṭukkal	—	the side of a hill[7]
e.	Aṭukkam	—	the side of a hill[8]
f.	Cilampu	—	the side of a hill[9]

Naccinārkkiniyar says that Malai and Varai refer to small hills and aṭukkal, aṭukkam and cilampu refer to the side of a hill. The difference between these needs investigation. Aṭukkam and aṭukkal may be the same, one being the corrupt form of the other.

(4) *Other-nouns* : Difference between various other nouns are also explained by Naccinārkkiniyar.

a.	Vāvi	—	the brook of a river
	Poykai	—	the natural tank not dug by men[10]

1. Jīvaka; v. 615.
2. Paṭṭiṉam; l. 287.
3. Jīvaka; v. 2112.
4. Kali; v. 41:16-17.
5. Ibid.
6. Kali; v.v. 41:16-17, 40:21.
7. Ibid; v. 40:21.
8. Ibid; v. 45: 16-17.
9. Ibid; v. 46:25-26.
10. Jīvaka; v. 337.

b.	Tēṉ	—	the honey in the honey comb
	Matu	—	the honey in the flower ; nectar[1]
c.	Makaḷir	—	common name for women
	Maṅkaiyar	—	married women[2]
d.	Eyiṟu	—	permanent teeth
	Pal	—	milk teeth[3]
e.	Paṭai	—	The army that has come from elsewhere
	Tāṉai	—	Stationary army[4]
f.	Aravam	—	snake
	Pāntaḷ	—	big snake[5]

4.2.3. *Verbs*

There are several verbs which have the same meaning occuring in literature. 'Ayilutal' means eating; uṇṇutal tiṉṉutal, parukutal, nakkutal—they all refer to different modes of eating. The commentators of Tolkāppiyam bring out these distinctions. Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar who himself is a commentator of Tolkāppiyam brings out the distinctions between verbs at various places.

a.	Muṟuvalittal	—	to smile
	Nakutal	—	to laugh[6]
b.	Nāṟutal	—	artificial smell
	Kamaḻtal	—	natural fragrance[7]
c.	Kāṇutal	—	seeing with eyes
	Nōkkutal	—	considering with the mind[8]
d.	Ocital	—	droop down
	Olkutal	—	bending[9]

1. Jīvaka; vv. 64. 1823.
2. Malai; 1. 58.
3. Kali; v. 58:4.
4. Ibid; v. 15:3.
5. Kuṟiñci; 11. 259, 255.
6. Jīvaka; v. 1228.
7. Ibid; v. 500.
8. Ibid; v. 1710. Kali; v. 37; 1-10.
9. Kali; v. 77: 5-6.

e.	Vemmai	—	liking of others for one
	vīḻtal	—	one's liking for the another[1]
f.	Tēṟṟam	—	consoling or creating a belief with one's own words
	Teḷivittal	—	consoling through swearing on God[2]
g.	Māytal	—	non appearance
	Karattal	—	hiding[3]
h.	Kalattal	—	mere embracing
	Muyaṅkal	—	sexual act[4]
i.	Piṇittal	—	stringing together
	yāttal	—	binding[5]
j.	Nīṅkutal	—	physical leaving
	kaṭattal	—	mental separation[6]
k.	Akalal	—	leaving
	Tuṟattal	—	renunciation[7]
l.	Aviḻtal	—	the blossoming of the bud
	Alartal	—	blossoming[8]
m.	Aṟital	—	knowing the situation
	Ōrtal	—	knowing the significance of the situation[9]
n.	Olittal	—	the sound of a musical instrument made of leather.
	Ārttal	—	the sound of a wind instrument[10]
o.	Ēttal	—	praising
	Vāḻttal	—	blessing[11]
p.	Cōrtal	—	getting tired
	Acaital	—	shivering[12]

1. Kali; v. 78: 24-25.
2. Ibid; v. 98: 31-32.
3. Ibid; v. 142: 36.
4. Ibid; v. 128:12.
5. Ibid; v. 138:9.
6. Kali; v. 79: 20-21.
7. Jīvaka; v. 1177.
8. Ibid; v. 1651.
9. Ibid; v. 1726.
10. Ibid; v. 1776.
11. Jīvaka; v. 2128.
12. Ibid v. 3143.

q.	Pakartal	—	announcing to all
	Ar̲aital	—	-do-
	Kūr̲utal	—	informing one[1]

4.2.4. *Some other methods for differentiating the words with allied meanings*

(1) *One as the attribute of the other:* There is a line in Kalittokai "Kon̲r̲ai alaṅkal am teriyalān̲"[2] — here Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar explains—the God wearing the garland of well-blossomed flowers. Here alaṅkal is interpreted as blossoming like a garland or moving, whereas elsewhere it means garland. Alaṅkal here, according to Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar, becomes the attribute to the noun 'teriyal' which alone here means garland.

The line "Kan̲ai eri al̲al ampu" means the arrow that spits fire.[3] Eri and al̲al mean fire. Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar takes eri as a participle and says 'the arrow that spits burning fire'.

(2) *Differentiation of repeated words:* Sometimes the same word is repeated in a poem which one may explain as having been done for the sake of effect, but even here Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar gives two different but allied meanings for the word.

"Oruvir oruvir ōmpin̲ir kalimin̲"[4]

Here the journey of the tribe of dancers and musicians through the forest is described. Through the narrow way one should go holding one of the creepers clustering around. Even after crossing, he has to hold it hard lest, when released, it should hit the the face of the one that follows him. Every one has to cross in this way. Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar bears this in mind when he interprets this line. The line as such means 'May you cross one by one'; 'oruvir oruvir' has the force of the distributive pronoun. But Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar interprets this "May you cross, the one preceding safe-guarding the one that follows". The safe-guarding is that which was explained above. The first 'oruvir' refers to the one that is looked after and the second one refers to the one that looks after.

(3) Sometimes if the same verb gets repeated Nacci n̲ārkkin̲iyar interprets both the verbs, one differently from the other. Nōkki,

1. Jīvaka; v. 2205.
2. Kali; v. 150:1.
3. Jīvaka; v. 2249.
4. Malai; l. 218.

nōkki—meaning 'seeing seeing'. But he says that the first seeing is seeing with the mind, and the other with the eyes.[1]

4.3 *Different meanings but not Allied*

In all these pairs, the meanings are allied to each other. But there are other instances when the words which are interpreted alike by other commentators are interpreted in such a way that the two words refer to two different things.

4.3.1. *Nouns of quality*:

The Divine Feet of Lord Murukā are described by Nakkīrar as
"Mataṉ uṭai nōn tāḷ"[2]

Mataṉ and nōṉ are apparently two words with the same meaning referring to strength. So others interpret the phrase to mean 'very strong Feet'. But Naccinārkkiniyar feels that a poet of the calibre of Nakkīrar could not have wasted words like this. There must be another meaning, according to him. Mataṉ also means ignorance. So Naccinārkkiṉiyar interprets "the strong Feet that kill the ignorance of his devotees". The Feet display their strength in this killing. The rock-like ignorance is broken by Murukā. Uṭai refers to 'this breaking'. This meaning makes the picture more beautiful. There are many places where Naccinārkkṉiyar brings out the distinctions like this.

Irum pēr okkal[3]—here 'irum and 'pēr' apparently have the same meaning 'Big' but Naccinārkkiṉiyar says, the dark big family.

"Vālitu kiḷanta veṇ kāl cếy"[4]. It looks as though 'Vālitu' and 'veṇ' mean whiteness, but Naccinārkkiṉiyar interprets as 'wellgrown white-legged bull'. When vālitu means "well-grown".

"Vem vem celvaṉ"[5]—here celvaṉ, the sun, Naccinārkkiṉyar interprets the line as "the sun, hot and liked by all." The first "vem" means 'hot', the second 'liked by all'.

'Vaṇṇa vaṇṇatta malar'.[6] Naccinārkkiṉiyar explains as flowers of different colours and kinds'. The first 'vaṇṇam' refers to the 'colour' and the second to the kinds.'

---

1. Jivaka; v. 1004.
2. Muruku; 1. 4.
3. Perumpāṇ; 1. 25; Cirupāṇ; 1. 139.
4. Kali v. 105:17-18.
5. Porunar; 1. 136.
6. Kuṟiñci; 1. 114.

(2) *Making one of the paṇpus a verb:* "Cuṇaṅku aṇi vaṉa mulai"[1]—here 'aṇi' and vaṉam both may mean 'beauty'. Naccinārkkiṉiyar makes 'aṇi' as a relative participle, as the verbal root (aṇi) here having the force of a relative participle whereas vaṉa (vaṉam) is taken as a noun of quality used as an attribute to the noun "mulai.' The beautiful breast wearing-cuṇaṅku.

'Viraintu val eyti'[2]—here 'Viraintu', 'Val' mean 'fast. Naccinārkkiṉiyar holds 'viraintu' as a verbal participle, and the other a quality as he came running came fast. Viraintu has been interpreted to mean "having run", val is uri-c-col used here to go with 'eyti.'

'Toṉ Mutu peṇṭir'[3] — Toṉ and mutu mean old. Naccinārk-kiṉiyar considers the first 'Ton' as quality and the other as a verb. "Old aged woman".

Tuvar-c-cev vāy.[4] Both 'tuvar' and 'cev' mean the red colour of the lips. Naccinārkkiṉiyar makes the first a quality and the other a verb. 'The natural fair and reddened mouth. Naccinārkkiṉiyar probably takes cevvāy as viṉai-t-tokai. In 'cēnta' we have the root 'cē' which here probably occurs shortened as' ce'.

(3) *Making one of the paṇpus, the possessing the paṇpu:* "Maṇam kamal nāṟṟam"[5]—Maṇam and Nāṟṟam mean fragrance. But the commentator says the fragrance caused by objects of fragrance like pūṉuku. According to him 'Maṇam' means 'fragrant objects' and 'nāṟṟam means the 'fragrance.'

4.3.2. *Nouns other than paṇpu*

(1) *Interpreting different meanings :* When two nouns other than paṇpu are used, one is interpreted to mean something not allied to the other.

"Ceṟunar-t-tēyttu-c-cel camammurukki"[6]. Ceṟunar-t-tēyttal—to destroy the enemies. Celcamam murukkal—to destroy the battle field. Both of them apparently appear in the same meaning.

1. Kali; v. 60;1.
2. Malai; 1. 281.
3. Maturai; 1. 409.
4. Kali; v. 55:4.
5. Maturai; 1. 447.
6. Mūruku; 11. 98-100.

Naccinārkkiṉiyar interprets this as 'banishing the non-prejudiced outlook suggesting equanimity or camam. If one has a non-prejudiced outlook he cannot kill people. So before starting the war, that outlook is thrust aside. Naccinārkkiṉiyar is entering into the realms of philosophy. It reminds us of Lord Krishna's teachings to Arjuna (Pārtha) in Mahābhāratha. There are other instances where Naccinārkkiṉiyar gives a similar interpretation.[1]

(2) *Making one of the two nouns, a quality:* Teṉvarai-p-potiyil[2]—Varai meaning a mountain is an attribute of potiyil which is a mountain of that name. So it seems that varai meaning a mountain is unnecessary as Potiyil itself is used in that sense. So Naccinārkkiṉiyar interprets 'varai' as a boundary. 'Teṉ varai potiyil' thus means 'the potiyil hill standing as a boundary in the south.' There are several other places-where he makes distinctions in the the same manner.

a. Ēṭṭilai[3]

b. Marutam cāṉṟa marutam[4]

c. Marutam caṉṟa taṉ paṇai[5]

d. Tīmpuṉal malku nīr vitaiyam[6]

e. Pakaṭṭerutu[7]

(3) *Making one of the two nouns an attribute* : 'Cilai...vil'[8] is a passage where both the words denote the same thing i.e. bow. But Naccinārkkiṉiyar says that this means the bow made of cilai tree. Of these two words, Naccinārkkiṉiyar makes the second the noun and the first an attribute with another sense i.e. made of cilai tree. There are many other instances where he interprets in this manner.[9]

(4) *Making one of the nouns a verb* : "Tiṅkal mati mukam"[10]—Tiṅkal and mati mean the moon and so Naccinārkkiṉiyar makes 'mati' a verbal root having the force of relative participle, as he says 'Tiṅkal matitta mukam'—The face that is held in esteem by the

---

1. Jīvaka; vv. 1355, 2204, 2376, 2919.
2. Ibid; v. 697.
3. Perumpāṇ; l. 59.
4. Ciṟupāṇ; l. 186.
5. Maturai; l. 270.
6. Jīvaka; v. 162.
7. Ibid; v. 2775.
8. Kali; v. 15:1.
9. Kali; vv. 40:34. 49:10. Jīvaka; vv. 58, 1358, 2386, 2898.
10. Jīvaka; v. 643.

moon. There are many other instances for this kind of appreciation.[1]

4.3.3. *Verbs*

(1) *Interpretation of different meanings :* Having dealt with (1) paṉpu, and (2) nouns other than paṉpu, one may go on to cases where Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar deals with two verbs interpreting them differently.

"Mārpaka malarntu akaṉṟa mārpiṉāṉ"[2]

Here 'malarntu' and 'akaṉṟa' mean 'broad'. Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar does not consider 'malarntu' as an attribute for 'mārpiṉāṉ'. He makes the 'malarntu' the predicate of 'mal' (wrestling). He says that the skill of the hero in wrestling separated from others (paka) blossoms to its fullest extent (malarntu) and he has a broad chest. If the same is repeated twice he thus gives two different meanings for the same.

(2) *Making one of the two verbs an uri-c-col:* 'Cuṭar uṟa uṟa nīṇṭa' . . . . . varai'[3] - here the poet describes a mountain. 'uṟa' meaning 'to contact' occurs twice in the line. But the commentator gives different meanings. The hill is so high that it comes in contact with the sun. The first 'uṟa' denotes the contact of the mountain with the sun and the second 'uṟa, has been made an attribute to nīṇṭa (high) so that both mean "so high".

(3) *Other reasons*: "Vaḷḷai akavuvam vā ikuḷai nām, Vaḷḷai akavuvam vā"[4] Vaḷḷai-p-pāṭṭu is a kind of musical dialogue. "Vaḷḷai akavuvam vā" occurs twice. Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar says that the first one is spoken by the maid calling the heroine to sing about the cruelty of the hero. The heroine refuses and says that they can sing about the good qualities of the hero. 'Vaḷḷai akavuvam vā' means - "please come, let us sing vaḷḷai song.' Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar interprets the repetition as two independent statements made by two persons - the first by the maid, and the second by the heroine - both in different senses - one - singing the bad qualities of the hero and the other singing the good qualities. This interpretation of the commentator is in conformity with the musical dialogue. There are other instances where Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar interprets in this manner.[5]

---

1. Ibid; vv. 1587, 2749. etc.
2. Ibid; v. 2424.
3. Kali; v. 45: 16-17
4. Ibid; v. 42 : 6-9.
5. Kali; vv. 41 : 18-20, 41: 21-22.

4.4. *Avoidance of repetition of meaning by taking the sentence as elliptical*

If one of the two words occurring with the same meaning has no subject or object etc., Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar takes it as having suffered an ellipsis of the same. Sometimes both the words have no subject or object etc., and he takes them also as having suffered an ellipsis of the subject etc. Thus he differntiates the synonyms by giving them different subjects or oubjects etc. This can be classified under several heads with reference to the subject etc. since one or more of the synonyms suffer an ellipsis.

1. the subject of one of the two verbs.
2. the subjects of both the verbs.
3. the object of one of the two verbs.
4. the objects of both the verbs.
5. the special noun for a general word denoting place etc.
6. the things referred to by the demonstratives.
7. cause and effect.

4.4.1. *The subject of one of the two verbs*

"Nān̲am mika nār̲u kamaḻ kuñci"[1]

Here two verbs of the same meaning occur - Nār̲u and Kamaḻ - meaning 'the spread of fragrance'. Nār̲um - the subject of this is nān̲am (kastūri). Nān̲am mika nār̲um kuñci- 'the hair that is fragrant with the smell of kastūri. But there is another word 'kamaḻum' meaning fragrance. But there is no subject for this. Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar derives a subject for this word also. He says fragrant with natural smell. "Hair fragrant with the smell of kastūri, and fragrant with natural smell". Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar says at a different place also that the hair is fragrant with natural smell.[2]

4.4.2. *The subject of both the verbs*

"Eri ar̲u ar̲u kālai tōr̲u amaivarap paṇṇi.[3]

Here the 'ar̲u' is repeated (twice); it means "as and when it has the lack of it", this occurs twice. Lack of what ? The subject has not been explicitly stated, and so, two subjects have to be derived for both "ar̲r̲u, ar̲r̲u". The first 'ar̲u' refers to 'the lack of oil' in

1. Jīvaka; v, 500.
2. Malai; l. 30.
3. Neṭu; ll. 103-104.

the lamps, the second, to its "extinguishing stage with its light about to go out". So two subjects have been derived, oil and light. 'Ammivarappaṇṇi' means oil has been poured" and "the light revived.

4.4.3. *The object of one of the two verbs*

"Kuṭi puṟaṅ kāttōmpum ceṅkōlāṉ" is a line occuring in Kalittokai.[1] Here, 'Ceṅkōlāṉ', the king w th the sceptre described, is Pāṇḍya. Puṟaṅkā ttal and ōmpum are the two actions of Pāṇḍya. These two verbs kāttu and ōmpum have the same meaning. The 'verb' kāttu has its object 'kuṭi'. 'Kuṭipuṟaṅkāttu' means 'to protect his countrymen'. What is the object of the verb 'ōmpum'? Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar takes the object to have suffered ellipsis. The king, if he thinks of defending himself, would be considered selfish. So, 'pūṟaṅkāttu' is interpreted as "defending his countrymen". This is stated earlier and defending himself is mentioned later. Ōmpum has the object himself which has suffered ellipsis. The protection of oneself is from passions. Here, the duty of the king is well brought out. This can be compared with Parimēlaḻkar's interpretation of a Tirukkuṟaḷ, 'to defend the citizens against the attacks of the enemies and his own self.[2] There are other instances where Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar interprets like this.[3]

4.4.4. *The objects of both the verbs*

"Tinkaḷum maṟuvum enac cērntatu
Naṅkaḷ aṉpu eṉa nāṭṭi valippuṟīi"[4].

Here Jīvaka compares the love between him and his lady - to the moon and the black spot on it. 'Nāṭṭi' and 'valippuṟīi' mean, the same thing, 'established'. As the moon starts waning, in that stage, the black spot leaves it altogether, but when the moon is full the black-spot again appears. By this comparison, Jīvakaṉ points out to his lady that there is bound to be separation (as the black-spot which vanishes) and even if they are separated for a short while, they are bound to meet again (as conveyed by the full moon and the black-spot). So 'Nāṭṭi' establishes the first truth 'separation' and 'Valippuṟīi' establishes the second truth, that they would definitely meet again. Nacciṉārkkiniyar's interpretation here heightens the beauty of the poem. There are also other places like this.[5]

---

1. Kali; vi 130:19.
2. Kuṟaḷ; v. 549.
3. Kali; vv. 140:23-24, 27-28, 24:8-12, 75:14-15.
4. Jīvaka; v. 1334.
5. Ibid; vv 268, 1707, etc.

4.4.5. *The special noun for a general word*

"Vakai cāl ulakkai vayin̲ vayin̲ ōcci"[1]

The pestle (ulakkai) is raised and it crushes grains. There are two words vayin̲, vayin̲ now occurring as place nouns in the locative significance. The places are not specified, The persons who are pounding are the heroine and the maid. Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar says let us crush raising the pestle between 'me' (maid) and 'you' (heroine). The nouns derived for both the place nouns (viz., vayin̲) are in my place an̲d "in your place" (envayin̲ and ninvayin̲).

4.4.6. *The things referred to by the demonstratives derived*

"Avai avai mun̲ikuvam en̲in̲ē".[2] It means 'if we dislike those'. The word 'avai' (those) is repeated twice. The demonstrative "those", occurring twice, does not explicitly point out to anything in particular. So Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar brings out those things referred to by the demonstratives, the things which the poet has already described in the previous lines. They are boiled mutton (puḻukkin̲a ir̲aicci) and fried mutton (cūṭṭir̲aicci). "If we dislike those two, boiled mutton and fried mutton"—that is the meaning of the line. There are other passages where Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar exploits this method of criticism.

4.4.7 *Cause and effect-derived*

'Akal iru vicumpu'[3]. It means 'the broad big sky'. "Akal and Iru" both ordinarily mean "broad" and "big" respectively. Nacci-n̲ārkkin̲iyar does not want to waste both the adjectives for the same subject. Akal-means to spread. Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar says 'that among the five elements, the other four elements spread within the boundary of the sky and the sky is the cause for their spreading out thus. The other four spreading out elements are the effects and the sky is the cause. Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar interprets "Akaliru vicumpu" whenever it occurs, like this.[4]

4.5. *Dislodgement of synonymous words or poetic Inversion*

There are places where Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar is not able to distinguish the meaning of words occuring in the same sense as he does at most other places. Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar tries to relieve the poem from repetition by taking one of the words to a different place so as to go with some other word when both the words become significant and also

1. Kali; v. 40;5.
2. Porunar; 1. 107.
3. Perumpāṇ; 1. 1.
4. Maturai; 1. 267, Kur̲iñci; 1. 48., Malai 1. 100.

beautiful. Especially, if the words are nouns of quality or nouns of things, verbs etc., he prefers this method.

4.5.1 *Nouns of quality*

"Kiḷi maḷalai meṉ cāyalōr"[1] is a description of the women in Pattuppāṭṭu. 'Cāyalōr'–'delicate women'. Cāyal–delicacy.[2] But there is another noun of quality 'meṉmai' which means also 'soft' or 'delicate'. Tolkāppiyar, says that 'cāyal' means 'delicate'. Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar interprets the word as referring to delicate women, with delicacy in speech like that of a parrot 'meṉ' goes with 'maḷalai'. Here the two words 'meṉ' and 'cāyal' are split and put at different places.

Kiḷi meṉ maḷalai — delicacy in speech like parrot.
Cāyalōr — delicate women.

There are many instances where Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar employs this method of appreciation.[3]

4.5.2 *The nouns other than paṇpu*

"Collaṟiyā-p-pētai maṭavai maṟṟellā"[4]

This is addressed by the heroine to the maid. 'Pētai' and 'maṭavai' are forms of address generally referring to one who is ignorant. The maid as if she does not know what to tell the hero, is asking the heroine-what to tell him, and hence she is addressed as one who is ignorant and this is the interpretation given by Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar. Then, the other word, 'maṭavai' is superfluous. But Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar takes it as a form of address to the hero, to be spoken by the maid. "You, who are ignorant! go and tell the hero, "you are ignorant and you do not know how to tell your parents that you want to marry the heroine...," Here "Pētai" refers to the hero. Thus the two words become independent in the hands of Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar and the beauty of the poem increases.[5] There are many other places where Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar employs this method.[6]

---

1. Paṭṭiṉam; 11. 149-150.
2. Tol. Col; s, 325,
3. Muruku; 11. 100-102, Kali; vv. 56:16, 60:2, 67:6-8. 77:5-7, 101:27-29, 117:2-4.
4. Kali; v. 114:8.
5. Tolkāppiyar mentions these words as referring to different meanings. (Tol. Porul. Pērā; s. 252). According to Prof. Sōmasundara Bhārathiyār 'Pētamai' means innocence and 'maṭam' means stuPidity. (Tol. Meyppāṭṭiyal. S.S. Bhārathiyār; s. 4.)
6. Kali: vv. 58:2, 75:1-2, Jīvaka; vv. 1344, 2439.

4.5.3 *The verbs*

"Olku paci uḻanta oṭuṅku nuṇ maruṅkul"[1]

Here the waist of a lady is described 'maruṅkul' means 'waist'. There are two attributes, oṭuṅku and olku, both meaning generally 'little and thin'. So two words are unnecessary. Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar makes the word oṭuṅku as an attribute for 'paci' (hunger), and 'olku' as an attribute for the iṭai (waist). He effects a mutual change—

"Oṭuṅku paci uḻanta olku nuṇ maruṅkul".

'Oṭuṅku paci' means 'hunger which is the reason for the body being thin.' 'Olku' means 'to move as a helpless creeper' (nuṭaṅku) and it is a voluntary action, not necessitated by external reasons, to heighten the grace of personality. Oṭuṅku (thinning) is not so aesthetic as the word 'olku'. In relation to the prosaic and practical state of hunger, this 'oṭuṅku. is appropriate and in relation to poetic and romantic imagery, 'olku' is apt.[2] Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar's keen sense of beauty is evident. There are other instances where Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar interprets like this.[3]

4. 5. 4. *Noun and verb*

"Oppiṇai tan̲akkilātān̲"[4]. 'Oppu' and iṇai' are synonyms meaning 'equal'. It means, "he has no equal". But two words are unnecessary. So Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar makes one word a verb i. e. 'iṇai' and says 'he has no equaling comparison'. Thus the repetition is avoided. There is also another instance in Kalittokai for this method of appreciation.[5]

4. 5. 5. *Iṭai-C-Col*

"Peruñcan̲am aṟaikaṭal tirai olittāṅ ken̲a ārttatē".[6] It means 'the people assembled there, shouted like a roaring sea. Here āṅku, en̲a are both signs of comparison. One word is sufficient whereas the poet has employed two words to denote comparison. So Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar makes one of them viz., 'āṅku' a demonstrative, meaning 'there'. "The people shouted like a roaring sea at that place". There are also other instances which come under this method.[7]

---

1. Ciṟupāṇ; 11. 135-136.
2. Jīvaka; v. 654.
3. Kali; vv. 14-14-15, 64:15-17. Jīvaka, vv. 134, 300, 1070, 2302, 2838.
4. Jīvaka; v. 1691.
5. Kali; v. 108:62.
6. Jīvaka; v. 1833
7. Jīvaka; vv. 2106, 2354.

4. 6: *Non-Differentiation of Apparent Synonyms*

4. 6. 1. *Repetition denoting intensity*

"Viṅkeruttu eṟuḷ muṉpiṉ irumpuli"[1] - here two words occur describing the strength of the tiger. Eṟūl and muṉpiṉ both mean 'the strength', Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar, who usually distinguishes such words that are apparently similar, is silent in this context, but just mentions "the very strong tiger". Similarly at another place he says for 'vāḷ oḷi' very bright light,[2] though 'vāḷ, oḷi' mean one and the same thing, 'bright or light'.

4. 6. 2. *Repetition denoting continuity*

"Oli koṇṭa cummai"[3] - Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar interprets this as meaning "the sound that contains all the incessant noise". Here he adds that oli (sound) is an attribute of 'cummai' (sound). What the commentator probably means is that the noise is continuous. There is also another instance, "Muḻaṅku iraṅku icai".[4] Here Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar interprets "the sound that sounds without interruptions". Here also he means the continuity of the sound.

4. 6. 3. *Repetition showing emotion*

"Eṉṉē maṟṟeṉṉē ni moḻintatu eṉṉē"[5] - here 'eṉṉe' occurs thrice in interrogative sense. Jīvakaṉ has heard through his teacher that his mother is alive, but he asks this question 'eṉṉē, eṉṉē, eṉṉē! thrice. Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar says this denotes his anxiety to know at once something regarding her existence. This is sanctioned by Grammar also.[6]

4. 6. 4. *Superlative degree*

Kaḻi peruṅ kātalāḷ[7] - there are two attributes kaḻi and perum for kātal. These words can occur as separate bound forms. But when they come combined as here as 'kāliperum' they form one unit without being separated. Therefore one has to distinguish these as occurring together and as occurring separately. The combination has the meaning of "very great" thus filling up the lacuna created by the

1. Kali; v. 48:6-7.
2. Jivaka; v. 1192.
3. Kali; v. 68:18.
4. Malai, ll. 323-324.
5. Jīvaka; v. 1883.
6. Tol. Col; s. 424.
7. Jīvaka; v. 203.

absence of comparative degree etc. Naccinārkkiniyar therefore points out the Tolkāppiyam rule here, which mentions the occurrence of these words as one unit denoting the same meaning.

4. 6. 5. *Emphasis with a purpose*

Mācilāḷ piṟanta ñaṉṟē mativalāṉ vitiyiṉ eṇṇi
Kācilāḷ kaṇṭa pōḷtē katumeṉa naṇappaṭṭāḷ.[1]

Here Kēmacari is referred to as 'Mācilāḷ' and 'Kācilāḷ'. It means one without blemish. She has to look at many men before deciding on the person who is to be her husband. But the convention is that a woman should not look at other men save her own husband. Though Kēmacari sees many men, yet, her mind is pure, and without blemish. Naccinārkkiniyar says, only to emphasise this point the poet repeats 'kācilāḷ', mācilāḷ', which have the same meaning.

4. 6. 6. *Is differentiation obvious?*

'Kūviyar tūṅkuvaṉar uṟaṅka'[2]. 'Kūviyar' means 'those who sell appam (a sweet dish). Here their sleeping is described. Tūṅkuvaṉar, uṟaṅka - both mean 'sleeping'. Naccinārkkiniyar says 'the appam sellers, as they sleep'. Here 'tūṅkuvaṉar' is used by him and he has not assigned any meaning for it. He simply interprets the repetition as 'tūṅkuvaṉarāy uṟaṅka' but 'tūṅku' also means 'to move'. The appam sellers are selling their dishes throughout the night, and they are sleeping in a sitting pose. They move from one side to the other as they sleep. So Tūṅkuvaṉar uṟaṅka" means "moving from one side to the other, they sleep". But Naccinārkkiniyar has not pointed out this, perhaps, according to him the meaning 'Tūṅkuvaṉar' is obvious.

"Eṟiyā vāḷum eṟṟā maḷuvum"[3] - Naccinārkkiniyar interprets this as meaning the 'vāḷ' that does not cut, and the 'Maḷu' that does not cut. Here he does not distinguish between the words 'eṟiyā' and 'eṟṟā'. 'Eṟi' and 'eṟṟu' are two words which must denote slightly different actions. It is strange that Naccinārkkiniyar who distinguishes between words of more subtle difference, has not pointed out this. 'Eṟital' is a verb for the vāḷ (sword) and 'Eṟṟutal' is a verb for the 'Maḷu'. The very fact that two distinct words are employed denotes their difference. That is why he does not feel the necessity for distinguishing things which are well known. That in effect eṟi and eṟṟu

1. Jīvaka; v. 1451.
2. Maturai; l. 627.
3. Kali; v. 84:8.

mean the same thing is alone pointed out so as not to be mistaken otherwise.

4.6.7 *Difference not pointed out*

There are places where Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar has not given any reasons for such occurrences, but just mentions them as they are and leaves them at that. They may be explained on the basis of the interpretations already given.

1. Vārātamaivān̲ō vārātamaivān̲ō......[1]
2. Maṇipōlattōn̲r̲um maṇipōlattōn̲r̲um.[2]
3. Tur̲akkuvan̲allan̲ tur̲akkuvan̲allan̲.[3]
4. Iḷamalaiyāṭum iḷamalaiyāṭum.[4]
5. Īr̲ai ir̲ai pottir̲r̲u-t-ti.[5]
6. Mār̲u mār̲u yān̲ peyarppa.[6]
7. Muyaṅkippotivēm muyaṅkippotivēm.[7]
8. Mun̲n̲ōn̲ mur̲ai mur̲ai kāṭṭa.[8]
9. Pir̲a pir̲avum nan̲i viraii.[9]
10. Paiya mellavē.[10]

4.7. *Polysemy*

4.7.1. *Ambiguity avoided*

In literature or grammar there are places where one word with different meanings occurs and it is the duty of the commentators to point out the meaning of the word in the context.

"Ulakam uvappa[11]"

is the first line in Tirumurukār̲r̲uppaṭai. Here Nakkīrar says "as the living species became happy". 'Ulakam' has many meanings as world, living species and conduct. Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar points out though it has many meanings as stated earlier yet by the verb

1. Kali; v. 41:28-31.
2. Ibid; v. 41:32-34.
3. Ibid; v. 41:35-38.
4. Ibld; v. 41:25-27.
5. Ibid; v. 145:57-58.
6. Kali; v. 111:20.
7. Ibid; v. 106:34-35.
8. Neṭu; 1. 177.
9. Paṭṭin̲am; 11. 180-181.
10. Jīvaka; v. 2999.
11. Muruku; 1.1.

'uvappa' (to become happy) it is evident that it refers only to the living-species. Tolkāppiyar calls such words, which may denote their specific meanings by the verb that follow, "Viṉai vēṟu paṭūum palaporuḷ oru col".[1] Parimēlaḻakar also, whenever the word 'ulakam' occurs, points out the context in which it has occured.[2]

4.7.2. *Pointing out the various meanings*

"Pū-v-unti amuta āṟu pūṅkoṭi nuṭaṅka-p-pōntu" is another line where Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar points out the various meanings denoted by the word 'unti' - navel, the extinct part of the river, the creeper like waist and the creeper.[3]

4.7.3. *Various meaning not mentioned*

"Koṉṉiṟa-k-kaḷiṟṟiṉ ucci"[4]. Koṉ has several meanings. But Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar, who eleswhere points out several meanings fro such words, does not here point out the various meanings, but simply says 'koṉ' means fear. Tolkāppiyar points out the different meanings of this word.[5]

1. Tol. Col. ss. 52-53.
2. Kuṟaḷ; vv. 1, 11; 20, 996; 280, 425; 140, 670; 841, 970, 994, 1025, 215. etc.
3. Jīvaka; v. 2460.
4. Jīvaka; v. 2257.
5. Tol. Col. s. 256.

PART II

NACCINĀRKKINIYAR AS A CRITICAL GRAMMARIAN

CHAPTER — 5

TRADITIONAL METHODS OF CRITICISM

5.1. *Objections and clarifications*

There are many ways of appreciating a literary or grammatical work and one of them, as enunciated by Tolkāppiyam, is to raise a variety of questions viewing things from the stand-point of a discriminating reader and then effect a co-ordination.

"Marutalai-k-kaṭāa maṟṟamum uṭaittāy"[1] is a line in Tolkāppiyam in this connection. All the commentators have applied this form of criticism and Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar excels in this. The questions he puts to himself can be classified thus :

1. The statement being seemingly in conflict with a grammatical generalisation made elsewhere.
2. The statement being seemingly in conflict with literary usage.
3. The statement being seemingly self-contradictory.
4. The statement being seemingly circumlocutory or unnecessarily complex.
5. The statement being seemingly not comprehensive.
6. The statement being seemingly superfluous.

5.1.1. *Conflict with grammar*

Tolkāppiyar refers to Viravuppeyar i.e. the nouns common to uyartiṇai and Akṟiṇai (superior and inferior categories) as,

"Akṟiṇai viravu-p-peyar"[2]

But in another place he has stated that these nouns are common to uyartiṇai and akṟiṇai. This raises a question, how he can mention these common nouns as 'akṟiṇai viravuppeyar' i.e. the nouns of

---

1. Tol. Poruḷ. Iḷam; s. 650
2. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 155., Tol. Col; s. 152.

inferior category mixing up", when the mixing up is in respect of both, how can he mention akṟiṇai only? So is it not in conflict with the sūtra in Collatikāram where he refers to it as common to both uyartiṇai and akṟiṇai.[1] Naccinārkkiniyar raises this objection and he himself answers the question. Cāttaṉ, Cātti are common to both uyartiṇai and akṟiṇai. Their suffixes denote uyartiṇai, as these refer to masculine and femenine genders. Akṟiṇai has no gender indications. So, even in akṟiṇai, the gender suffixes prescribed for uyartiṇai denote their genders.

1. Cāttaṉ periyaṉ - Masculine.	}	uyartiṇai.
Cātti periyaḷ—Feminine.		
2. Cāttaṉ peritu —Masculine.	}	akṟiṇai.
Cātti peritu—Feminine		

Here it is evident that the gender suffixes 'aṉ' and 'i' in respect of uyartiṇai (in Example No. 1) occur for akṟiṇai also to denote gender. Tolkāppiyar, therefore, in Collatikāram calls these words, Cāttaṉ, Cātti etc. common to both uyartiṇai and akṟiṇai.[2] But here it is evident that akṟiṇai mixes up with uyartiṇai, to take to their gender indications. So Tolkāppiyar, here in Eḷuttatikāram, says "Akṟiṇai viravuppeyar" (akṟiṇai mixing up with uyartiṇai) and refers to akṟiṇai only, thereby explaining the real characteristic feature of these common nouns i.e. Cāttaṉ, Cātti, etc.[3]

5.1.2. *Conflict with literary usuage*

Naccinārkkiniyar is not only a great grammarian but a great literary critic. He reconciles the literary application with grammar. In Tolkāppiyam it is stated that 'kaḷ' denotes the plural in the akṟiṇai.[4]

Singular		*Plural*
Malai	...	Malaikaḷ
Maram	...	Maraṅkaḷ
Kutirai	...	Kutiraikaḷ

But in literature the words belonging to uyartiṇai also take to 'kaḷ' for pluralisation.

1. Tol, Col.; s. 174.
2. Ibid; s. 174.
3. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 155.
4. Tol. Col; 171.

'Veṟiyuṟu kamaḷ kaṇṇi Vēntarkaḷ'
'Piṟantavarkaḷ ellām avāpperiyarāki'
'Kaṟṟanaṅkaḷ yāmu muṭan kaṟpanakaḷ ellām'
'Eṅkaḷ viṉaiyāl iṟaivan.........

Here Vēnṭar, Piṟantavar, kaṟṟaṉam, em - have all taken the 'kaḷ' suffix. So Naccinārkkiniyar raises the question, whether the rule in Tolkāppiyam with reference to the usuage of 'kaḷ' suffix is not in conflict with these literary evidences. The 'ar' suffix in 'vēntar' and 'Piṟantavar' and 'am' in kaṟṟaṉam', denote the plural. But what is this 'kaḷ' for? According to Naccinārkkiniyar 'kaḷ' in these words, is used for the sake of prosody and it does not indicate - plural. He also gives another justification. There is a sūtra in Tolkāppiyam which says :

"Kaṭi col illai kālattu-p-paṭinē"[1]

It means there could be grammatical sanction for new forms of words gaining more or less universal currency at a later stage. Naccinārkkiniyar would justify the usage in this way, as 'Peṇṭu' (woman) occurs as Peṇṭukaḷ (women), where there is no other plural suffix. There are other instances where he uses this method of analysis.[2]

5.1.3 *The statement seemingly self-contradictory*

The hero and heroine in love with each other elope if there should be any objection to their marriage.[3] Naccinārkkiniyar says that Tolkāppiyar considers this as separation from the heroine, the conduct prescribed for 'pālai'. After stating this, he raises an objection himself. How can this be separation, when the hero and heroine are together and conduct of 'Puṇarcci' is not difficult for them at this situation? He answers this question himself. Though they are together, the idea that they will be followed by their kith and kin, will be uppermost in their minds, and this will be a mental hazard for their conduct of 'Puṇarcci'. The feeling that they have eloped and they have separated from their relatives weighs on them so heavily that they will be always thinking of this only. Tolkāppiyar has enunciated this in Poruḷatikāram.[4] Naccinārkkiniyar thus explains how this comes under 'separation' and why the poems in

1. Tol. Col; s. 452.
2. Tol. Col; ss. 106, 219, 463, etc.
3. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 15.
4. Ibid s. 41:3-5.

Aiṅkuṟunūṟu, Kali, and Akanāṉūṟu, describing elopement are included in pālaittiṇai.[1] There are other instances which he has justified in this manner.[2]

5. 1. 4. *Circumlocutory or complex statement*

The rules that Tolkāppiyar prescribes for the reflexive pronouns Tām, Nām, Nīr, etc, taking case suffixes strike one as peculiar. For example 'Tām' becomes 'Tamatu'. He says that the initial long vowel becomes short in the root word (Tām—Tam) and then it takes a vowel 'a' before it merges with the case suffix 'atu' (Tama). When it merges, the 'a' in the case suffix 'atu' vanishes and becomes thus:[3]

Tām + atu — Tam + atu—Tama + atu — Tama atu — Tamatu.

The rule strickes one as peculiar as it is natural to hold that in Tam + atu, the initial letter in the case suffix 'a' marges with the final consonant of 'Tam'.

1. Tam + atu — Tamatu

But Tolkāppiyar introduces a new vowel 'a' and then adds, that the 'a' in the case suffix 'atu' vanishes.

2. Tama tu — Tamatu

Naccinārkkniyar raises the question can it not be similar to the first example i.e. Tam + atu Tamatu (where there is no need of bringing in a new 'a' for the preceding word and removing the old 'a' in the succeeding word 'atu').

His analysis is remarkable. There are words like 'niṉava' and 'eṉava' used in literature.[4] Here the 'a' standing as the final letter is the 6th case suffix (plural). But there is another 'a' preceding it (niṉ+a+a). Naccinārkkiṉiyar holds that this middle 'a' is the one which Tolkāppiyar has prescribed earlier.[5] In niṉava and eṉava both the vowels 'a' are intact. That is why Tolkāppiyar says that a vowel must be invariably be introduced and the 'a' that vanishes is that of the 6th case suffix.[6]

This reasoning of Naccinārkkiṉiyar looks logical with reference to niṉava and eṉava, but there is another sixth case suffix 'ātu'

1. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 15, pp. 53-55.
2. Tol. Col; ss. 96, 440, etc.
3. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 115.
4. Puṟam; v. 35:13.
5. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 161.
6. Ibid; s. 115.

occuring as 'Ta<u>n</u>ātu'.[1] According to Tolkāppiyar, if the 'ā' in the case suffix 'ātu' should vanish (as 'a' does in atu), it cannot become Ta<u>n</u>ātu. If Ta<u>n</u> + ātu should become Tā<u>n</u>ātu, there is no necessity for an introduction of the vowel 'a' with the reflexive pronoun.

But it can be argued that 'a' in the long vowel 'ā' vanishes and the 'a' prescribed by Tolkāppiyar merges to form the long vowel 'ā'.

(e.g.) Ta<u>n</u> + ātu—ta<u>n</u> a ātu — Ta<u>n</u>aatu—Ta<u>n</u>ātu

Here we must bear in mind that a long vowel constitutes two short vowels and in Sandhi, sometimes, one of them vanishes as is enunciated by Tolkāppiyar himself and illustrated by the commentators

Irā + u — Ira + u — Ira (v) u [2]

Anyway it must be said that Nacci<u>n</u>ārkki<u>n</u>iyar has not investigated this point.

5.1.5. *The statement being seemingly not comprehensive*

Nacci<u>n</u>ārkki<u>n</u>iyar lays down the definition of 'col' (word) in Collatikāram.[3] 'Col' is an instrument or means for anyone understanding the characteristics of the things which are either uyartiṇai or akṟiṇai. It consists of letters, and though pronounced letter after letter in a sequence, exists as an entity to call up a meaning in the mind of the hearer instead of remaining independent entities as letters. Here Nacci<u>n</u>ārkki<u>n</u>iyar raises a question. Is not this definition defective as not covering all words? If the letters were to follow each other in a sequence, to convey a message to the hearer, what about words that consist of only one letter and how can they also be said to create a meaning? Nacci<u>n</u>ārkki<u>n</u>iyar answers it himself. The words pronounced letter after letter are first conveyed to the ears and as they constitute a pattern of meaningful or significant sounds, exist as such in the mind of a hearer and thereby convey the meaning. But even a word consisting only of a single letter, forms a pattern of familiar sounds to the ear and the mind, and as such evokes a meaning in the mind of a hearer. Thus Nacci<u>n</u>ārkki<u>n</u>iyar proves that the definition he gives for 'word' is not defective but applicable to all the words including those consisting of a single letter. Elsewhere also he has raised objections of this type and answered them with reference to his own interpretations.[4]

---

1. Tol. Col; s. 80, p. 99.
2. Tol, Eḻuttu; s. 234.
3. Tol. Col; s. 1.
4. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 108.

5.1.6. *The statement being seemingly superfluous*

Tolkāppiyar says that the words (āṇ, peṇ) that are common both to uyartiṇai and akṟiṇai undergo no change in Sandhi.[1]

āṇ + kai āṇkai

Peṇ + kai peṇkai

But elsewhere in Tokaimarapu, Tolkāppiyar has said that the words common to uyartiṇai and akṟiṇai in Sandhi suffer no change.[2] It can be asked naturally whether the first rule does not include the other also. Naccinārkkiniyar raises this question, and draws a distinction between these rules. The words common to both uyartiṇai and akṟiṇai discussed in the earlier sūtra are different from the words discussed later.

Cāttaṉ kuṟiyaṉ, Cāttaṉ kuṟitu.

Cātti kuṟiyaḷ, Cātti kuṟitu.

Here whether they belong to uyartiṇai or akṟiṇai is denoted by the verbs, but the word āṇ and peṇ, as such both in the senses of uyartiṇai and akṟiṇai have akṟiṇai endings. These words 'aṇ' and 'peṇ', as they are, indicate their identity as common nouns without the need for any suffix, whereas the words Cāttaṉ and Cātti indicate their identity as common nouns only by their concordance with the verbs belonging to both categories. Naccinārkkiniyar points out this subtle differentiation and justifies Tolkāppiyam.[3]

5.2. *Doubts and Clarifications*

Tolkāppiyar refers to the various aspects of commentaries and formulates rules for them and these are in fact our ancient methods of literary appreciation. The commentator has to raise some questions pertaining to the specific point and answer them. We discussed this earlier. There may be some ideas expressed in a work that may lead to doubts and need clarification. Tolkāppiyar has said that a commentator has to establish the true idea of a passage from among various possible interpretations.[4]

5.2.1. *Ambiguities cleared by the author himself*

Tolkāppiyar himself has cleared certain doubts in the minds of a reader regarding the interpretations of his Sūtras. As a matter of

1. Ibid; s. 303.
2. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 155.
3. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 303.
4. Tol. Poruḷ. Iḷam; 650.

fact Tolkāppiyar is in the true tradition of great grammarians, and so a critic as well. He is aware of the doubts that might arise in the minds of his readers regarding the explanation of some of his sūtras and he clears the doubts himself. For example:

1. K and ṅ, these letters are produced when the back part of the tongue and back part of the palate are in firm contact.[1]
2. c and ñ — these letters are produced when the middle part of the tongue and middle part of the palate are in firm contact.[2]
3. ṭ and ṇ — these letters are produced when the front part of the tongue and front part of the palate are in firm contact.[3]

(1) It means that all the six consonants prescribed have three origins. k, ṅ by the firm contact of the back part of the tongue and palate, c, ñ by the middle and ṭ, ṇ by the front.

(2) But there can be another interpretation of this sūtra, k by the firm contact of the back part of the tongue, and 'ṅ' by the firm contact of the back palate and it means two origins and if such an interpretation is extended to the others, then it means six origins.[4]

Tolkāppiyar clears this doubt in the sūtra that follows immediately. He makes it clear that the origins are three. Naccinārkkiniyar points out that Tolkāppiyar has stated the sūtra to clear the doubt that may have risen because of the previous sūtra. He points out such clarifications of Tolkāppiyam in many other places also.[5] Naccinārkkiniyar himself follows this method and has cleared the possible doubts of readers at many places.

5. 2. 2. *Vēṟṟumai - t - tokai or ummai - t - tokai?*

"Puli vil keṇṭai vaittāṉ" - here (ai) the sign of the accusative case and 'um' the sign of conjunction are understood. This construction can be expanded thus:

'Puliy-ai-yum Villaiyum keṇṭaiyaiyum vaittāṉ'

Here two things are understood, case sign and conjunctional sign, so is it vēṟṟumaittokai or ummai-t-tokai. Cēṉāvaraiyar says that the conjunctional idea is upper most in this construction and so

1. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 89.
2. Tol-Eḷuttu; s. 90.
3. Ibid; s. 91
4. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 92.
5. Ibid; ss. 5, 50, 103, 104, 106, 136.

according to him it is ummai-t-tokai, where conjunctional sign 'um' is understood.[1] But Naccinārkkiniyar holds it as Vēṟṟumaittokai where 'ai' the accusative case sign is understood. According to him, here, the idea as soon as one reads the statement, that is uppermost in the mind of the reader is to know the object only.[2] The natural thing is to inquire not what are the things said in the list, but only what is the object of the verb. Iḷampūraṇar also has given the same interpretation.[3]

5. 2. 3. *Vēṟṟumai-t-tokai or uvamaittokai*

There is another place where Naccinārkkiniyar clears such doubts. Matimukam can be expanded thus:

'Matiyai okkum Mukam'.

It means the face that is like the moon. In this expansion 'ai' the accusative case sign and 'okkum' the sign of simile-both are explicit but in the compound 'Matimukam' both are understood. Is this compound-Vēṟṟumaittokai, or uvamaittokai? When we say 'Matimukam' the idea that strikes us immediately is comparison and the case sign occurs only to extend the meaning of the comparison and hence the comparison is primary and the case aspect is secondary. So it is uvamaittokai according to Naccinārkkiniyar.[4] Cēnāvaraiyar has not cleared the doubt but mentions it and leaves it at that. If the case idea is in mind, it is Vēṟṟumaittokai, and if the idea of comparison is in mind, it is uvamaittokai according to him.[5] This explanation looks tautologous or jejune and Naccinārkkiniyar's interpretation is in conformity with psychological understanding. Naccinārkkiniyar at another place clears the doubt with reference to 'Uyartiṇai' and says that it is not 'Paṇputtokai' but 'Vinaittokai'.[6]

5. 2. 4. *Address to the guardsman or to the Patron*

Naccinārkkiniyar clears certain doubts regarding Pāṭāṇ tiṇai (a tiṇai where a poet going to a patron, after praising him, narrates his conditions of poverty and requests him to give redress). Kaṭai nilai is one of the constituents of pāṭāṇ tiṇai. It is the request to the guardsman to inform the patron of his arrival. So naturally the doubt arises how kaṭainilai can come under 'pāṭāṇ tiṇai' when pāṭāṇ tiṇai is in address to the patron and kaṭainilai is an address to

1. Tol. Col. Cēnā; s. 291.
2. Tol. Col. s. 293.
3. Tol. Col. Iḷam; s. 286.
4. Tol. Col. s. 414.
5. Tol. Col. Cēnā; s. 414.
6. Tol. Col. s. 416, p. 404.

the guardsman. Naccinārkkiniyar clears this doubt by saying that the guardsman is only a medium and as a matter of fact the poet is addressing the patron through the guardsman and conveying to the patron his abject penury and expectation of relief. So naturally, according to Naccinārkkiniyar it must come under 'pāṭāṇ tiṇai'.[1]

5. 2. 5. *Whether ōmpaṭai can come under pāṭāṇ?*

Ompaṭai belongs to pāṭāṇ tiṇai. The poet prays that his patron should live long without being exposed to the risks of ill omen. (inauspicious day, time or bird). There may arise a doubt whether it can come under pāṭān. 'Pāṭāṇ is the counterpart of Kaikkiḷai in Akattiṇai.[2] Kaikkiḷai involves the love of a man towards a girl who shows no response because of her immaturity.[3] In pāṭāṇ also, the patron wants to be praised and the poet, by praising him, wants to gain wealth from him. Each has his own aim, and the patron giving wealth and the poet praising the patron are both incidental from their respective point of view. So, it is the counterpart of kaikkiḷai.[4] But in ōmpaṭai the ultimate aim is that the patron should live long. How then can it come under pāṭāṇ tiṇai? Naccinārkkiniyar argues that the poet praises the patron who has been supporting him all along and who is now in trouble. So, though material gain may not be his immediate consideration he has in mind all the gifts given by the patron to him earlier. So even here the wealth is the consideration. 'He gave me wealth and he must live long' - and this is his view and hence it should come under 'pāṭāṇ'.[5]

5. 2. 6. *Āṇpār kāñci or Peṇpār kāñci?*

Naccinārkkiniyar, sometimes, interprets Tolkāppiyam bearing in mind the social conditions of people who lived at the time of Tolkāppiyar. Tolkāppiyar lists all kinds of transitoriness under Kāñcitiṇai. Naccinārkkiniyar classifies them as Āṇpār kāñci and Peṇpārkāñci (transitoriness prescribed for men and transitoriness prescribed for women). Tolkāppiyar mentions two constituents of kāñci tinai: (1) Taputāra nilai, (2) Tāpatanilai. The former refers to the loss of wife and the latter, the loss of husband.

Taputāra nilai: here the woman (wife) loses her life and body, and as it pertains to the loss of her life and body is it Peṇpār kāñci?;

1. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 90:3-4.
2. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 80.
3. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 50,
4. Ibid; s. 80.
5. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 93: 16-18, P. 331.

but as the husband loses the pleasures of married life, is it Āṇpāṟkāñci? Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar says as the loss of life and body with reference to the woman is permanent, but as the husband can remarry, it is not Āṇpāṟkāñci but peṇpāṟkāñci.[1]

Tāpatanilai - loss of husband; the wife and the husband lived together like 'one life' and here the loss of life, body and its pleasures, and wealth is so keenly felt by the woman, that she is practically dead - it is also Peṇpāṟkāñci. Here the importance of man in society is the basis of Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar's interpretation.[2]

5. 2. 7. *Doubts that could not be cleared*

There are certain places which land Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar himself in confusion and he is not able to clarify the doubts. Toṭākkāñci, Talaiyoṭu muṭital, Āñci-k-kāñci are some of the constituents of kāñci-t-tin̲ai. In the battle-field where the husband lies dead, the heroine protects his body without being tortured by demons. This is Toṭākkāñci.

As the husband has lost his life, body and pleasure it can be called 'Āṇpārkāñci'. But as the women loses her life (her husband) pleasures and wealth together it can be called Pen̲pāṟ kāñci also. So a doubt arises regarding the classification.

Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyār says that when the hero was alive, the heroine — derived pleasures by embracing him, but now, though she stays protecting his body till dawn, she does not touch him. Even the devoted wife does not touch the body; it has reached such a state of transitoriness. So it is Āṇpāṟkāñci. But it is evident that it involves to some extent 'peṇpāṟkāñci also'. Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar admits this interpretation as well. Since these are common to Āṇpāṟkāñci and Peṇpāṟkāñci, it is mentioned by Tolkāppiyar, according to Naccin̲ārkkin̲yiar, after Āṇpāṟkāñci and before Peṇpāṟkāñci so as to be applicable to both, though included under the subdivisions coming under Āṇpāṟkān̲ci.[3]

The husband and wife owed so much to each other and lived so like 'one life' that a classification is impossible. 'The merging of two into one' is the miracle of marriage in our ancient society. That is why Tolkāppiyar has also classified them under one heading, "Kān̲cittiṇai". Love means "mutual indispensableness".[4] If the

1. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 79:28.
2. Tol. Poruḷ; s, 79:29.
3. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 79: 10-11, p. 274.
4. Iṟaiyan̲ār; s. 2, p. 31. வேட்கை.... ஒருவர் ஒருவரை இன்றியமையாமை

husband or wife dies, it is almost death for the other. Tolkāppiyar has classified transitoriness into ten ten each, but had not called them Āṇpāṟkāñci and peṇpāṟkāñci. Naccinārkkiniyar has classified them this way and his attempts to bring them under each division does not succeed at all in some places. Iḷampūraṇar does not attempt such classifications.[1]

5.3. *Refutation Of Misinterpretations*

One of the methods of critical assessment as established by Tolkāppiyar is to refute misinterpretations.[2] There were many commentators before Naccinārkkiniyar, like Iḷampūraṇar, Cēṉāvaraiyar, Parimēlaḷakar, Pērāciriyar etc. and Naccinārkkiniyar generally agreed with them in their interpretation but wherever he differed from them he has established his points clearly. An interpretation according to Naccinārkkiniyar has to be declared false when it gives rise to one or more of the ten defects mentioned by Tolkāppiyar.

5.3.1. *Kūṟiyatu kūral (Tautology)*

We saw earlier how Naccinārkkiniyar establishes by his great ingenuity that Tolkāppiyar never repeats himself, and here we see him criticising the commentators whose interpretations are likely to make Tolkāppiyar subject to that charge of repetition. Tolkāppiyar states that one kind of medial clusters of two consonants consists of 'y' preceded by any one of the following viz: ñ, n, m, v.[3] Iḷampūraṇar gives the following examples for these clusters.

e.g. uriñyātu, porunyātu, tirumātu, tevyātu.

Naccinārkkiniyar questions the appropriateness of these illustrations. According to him, these clusters should occur in individual words and not in phrases or sequences of words. Tolkāppiyar has laid down rules for the latter, in Puṇariyal, and if he were to be interpreted according to Iḷampūraṇar, he will be subject to the charge that he repeated the Sandhi here under clusters and again later under Sandhi in Puṇariyal etc. Naccinārkkiniyar says that there must have been in existence such words as are indicated by Tolkāppiyar, but they have become obsolete later and hence the examples given by Iḷampūraṇar are wrong and unjustified.

---

1. Tol. Poruḷ. Iḷam; s. 77.
2. Tol. Poruḷ. Pērā; s. 659.
3. Toḷ. Eḻuttu; s. 27.

5.3.2. *Māṟukoḷakkūṟal* (*contradictory statements*)

Two ideas stated, at different places in the same work should not contradict each other and if a commentator interprets it in a way that is likely to involve such contradiction, the interpretation has to be rejected.

Tolkāppiyar says that the letter 'au' will not occur as the final letter of a word by itself as a separate vowel without becoming a syllable along with a preceding consonant or even joined with other consonants except k and v i.e. 'kau' and 'vau' alone can occur as words with 'au' as their final letters. This is what the author says in Eḻuttatikāram.[1] In collatikāram he refers to this 'au' ending occuring as it is and as undergoing aḷapeṭai (i.e. lengthening of the vowel) implying thereby certain suggestions.[2] Cēṉāvaraiyar gives examples 'au' and "auu" respectively. As Tolkāppiyar has said that the letter 'au' cannot occur as word final individually, these examples in collatikāram will make Tolkāppiyar subject to the charge of contradiction with what he has mentioned in Eḻuttatikāram. So Naccinārkkiṉiyar says that as Tolkāppiyar only refers to 'kau' and 'vau' in Eluttatikàram, he must have pointed out only to that aḷapeṭai here in collatikāram as well i,e. he must refer to kau and vau and not to 'au' which as already stated will not occur as a word individually.

5.3.3. *Mayaṅkakkūṟal* (*obscurity in literary in composition*)

A grammarian who lays down the rules and regulations of a language must refer to them with clarity and should leave no ground for ambiguity or obscurity, so as to cause confusion. Tolkāppiyar in one of his sūtras refers to the amassing of wealth which is ordinarily attributed to the merchants of vaṇikās.[3] The next sūtra is:

"Mēlōr muṟaimai nālvarkkum urittē"[4]

The word 'mēlōr' here as interpreted by Naccinārkkiṉiyar, refers to the Vaṇikās mentioned in the previous sūtra. The second sūtra states that this pursuit of wealth though characterising the Vaṇikās can be attributed to the four castes. An unknown commentator seems to have suggested not the general pursuit of wealth but specific methods of amassing wealth through trade as being applicable to the other four castes. This will lead to the confusion of the characteristic feature of the four castes, because, the ways in which the merchants earn wealth are different from the ways in which the

1. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 70
2. Tol. Col; s. 283.
3. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 28.
4. Ibid; s. 29.

other four castes (i.e. the kings, the Brahmins, the high class agriculturists and the tillers) earn their wealth. To avoid this confusion, Naccinārkkiniyar suggests that it is the general pursuit of wealth according to their respective profession which is intended here.

5. 3. 4. *In contradiction to the author's idea*

There is again criticism of a commentary as being in contradiction to the author's view. In criticising another commentator, Naccinārkkiniyar often points out the former is against the author since the latter does not contemplate the introduction of any word which the former introduces.

Tolkāppiyar says that the word 'ilam' with the word 'paṭu' in sandhi will not have any change.[1]

e. g. 'Ilampaṭu pulavar'.

Iḷampūraṇar and Naccinārkkiniyar agree to this extent, but Iḷampūraṇar explains the phrase 'ilampaṭu pulavar' as consisting of a word 'ilam' occuring in the meaning of ilattāl (āl-3rd case sign). The whole phrase, according to him will be expanded as "ilattāl paṟṟappaṭṭa pulavar" meaning "the scholars who have been afflicted by ilam (poverty)".

Naccinārkkiniyar interprets it as a subject predicate construction. According to him the phrase will expand as "illāmai uṇṭākiṉṟa pulavar" meaning the poets with reference to whom occurs illāmai (poverty). He states that the author does not use 'paṟṟu' while prescribing the Sandhi rule for 'ilam'; also 'paṭu' carries the tense suffix which has suffered an ellipsis here; therefore it is natural to expand it as 'paṭukiṉṟa'. So it is unnatural to expand the phrase as "ilattāl paṟṟappaṭṭa pulavar".

But Naccinārkkiniyar himself falls a prey to this defect. There are places where he assumes that the author's idea was such and such on that assumption contradicts other commentators. He says that 'māl' and 'kāl' are single lettered words. According to him Tolkāppiyar does not count the consonants, short 'u' and āytam as letters in a word.[2] But this applies only to poetry and not to prose. Tolkāppiyar calls nāku, āṭu, etc. as two lettered words. Kaṭṭu, kakcu, etc. are multi lettered words (toṭarmoḻi).[3] So it is obvious he counts here

1. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 316.
2. Tol, Eḻuttu; s. 45,
3. Ibid; ss. 406, 409, 411, etc.

the consonants, short u and āytam also as letters. So Naccinārkkiniyar's interpretation of Tolkāppiyam and the way he refutes the commentators are not always correct, There is a contradiction sometimes in his commentary itself. For instance, he refuses to admit that there are two letters in the word kāl (ka+l) whilst he himself states that 'kāy' (ka+y) has two letters. This is contradicting himself and it is pointed out by Sri Gaṇēsa Iyer in his edition of Tolkāppiyam.[1]

5.3.5 *Contradiction to Human nature*

Naccinārkkiniyar points out wherever the commentry of others is in conflict with human nature. Tolkāppiyar says:

"Epporuḷ āyinum allatu illenin
Apporuḷ allāp piṟitu poruḷ kūṟal"[2]

Here Tolkāppiyar explains one of the different kinds of answers. If a customer asks a merchant whether he has greengram and if the latter does not have it the merchant must answer if he has for instance black-gram which belongs to the category of gram, "I have nothing except black-gram". This is how Iḷampūraṇar interprets Tolkāppiyam sūtrā.

But Cēnāvaraiyar does not accept this. He states that, in giving a negative reply, the merchant need not restrict himself to speaking only about things related to the thing asked for. He may also say that he has nothing but pampuṇikkaruṅkal (a kind of stone) which is by no means related to the green-gram required by the customer.

But Naccinārkkiniyar criticises Cēnāvaraiyar. He points out that this is unnatural, because a buyer of green gram may be interested in buying blackgram if the green gram is not available, as he can replace the green gram by black gram, but he will not be interested in buying unrelated things which will not replace the thing he requires.

5.4 *A Discussion of Differences*

There are some grammatical points which seem apparently similar and it is very difficult to differentiate them one from another- Tolkāppiyar has laid down a sound principle in this connection. Two apparently similar things must be identified with their subtle

1. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 45, Foot-notes.
2. Tol. Col; s. 35.

differences distinctively shown, and individually determined.[1] Naccinārkkiniyar with his keen intellect is able to discriminate them in an ingenious manner. From the study of Naccinārkkiniyar we can bring them under the following heads:

1. Difference of letters (Homophones).
2. Technical terms differentiated.
3. Differentiation of allomorphs.
4. Homonyms of ambiguity resolved by grammatical category.
5. Homonyms of ambiguity resolved by Sandhi rules.
6. Root morphemes differentiated.
7. Suffix morphemes differentiated.

5. 4. 1. *Difference of letters* (*Homophones*)

In Dravidian dialects, especially in Tamil, they have defined the sound of the short vowel 'u'. It has one time unit (mātra) as full u (Murrukaram), but in some words it has reduced time unit i.e. ½ mātra as short 'u', known as 'kurrukaram. The 'u' that succeeds the long vowel or any two and merged with the hard consonants in the vowel consonants is the short 'u' known as 'kurrukaram'.[2] Tolkāppiyar also says that 'u' in 'Nuntai' is also short 'u'.[3] Naccinārkkiniyar analyses the subtle differences between short 'u' and 'u'.[4] They are :-

(a) Difference in Sandhi: It is possible for a vowel to succeed the kurrukaram without the loss of 'u'.

e. g. Nāku+aritu=Nākaritu ('u' and 'a' are both there) But it is not so in Murrukaram.

e. g. pacu+itu=Pacuvitu ('u' is not merged with 'i')

(b) Difference in quantity: Kurrukaram has reduced time-unit i. e. ½ mātra. Murrukaram has one time unit i. e. 1 mātra.

(c) Difference in sound: Kurrukaram is pronounced without the lips being rounded and Murrukaram in a rounded fashion.

(d) Difference in meaning; Kātu, kaṭṭu, kattu, Murukku, Teruṭṭu, Tarukku, Aṇukku — if they are kurrukaram they are — nouns, if they are Murrukaram they are verbs.

---

1. Tol. Poruḷ. Pērā; s. 659, p. 706.
2. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 36.
3. Ibid; s. 67.
4. Tol. Eḻuttu; ss. 36, 68

5.4.2. *Technical terms defined and differentiated*

There are certain grammatical classifications that seem apparently similar, but they must be descriminated. Naccinārkkiniyar attempts this and has succeeded to some extent.

Ākupeyar	x	Aṉmoḷittokai
Uraiyacai	x	Acainilai
Peyar	x	uri

(1) *Ākupeyar and aṉmoḷittokai*: Cénāvaraiyar holds that ākupeyar and aṉmoḷittokai are the same. Poṟṟoṭi, if considered as a noun, is 'ākupeyar' and if considered as a tokai (in the aspect when certain things are understood) it is aṉmoḷittokai.[1] 'Makkaṭcuṭṭut according to Cēṉāvaraiyar is 'aṉmoḷittokai' and Naccinārkkiniyar holds it as ākupeyar. Cēṉāvarayiar extends this compound as aṉmoḷittokai based on paṇputtokai.[2] Naccinārkkiniyar extends this compound as paṇputtokai (Noun compound) which suggests the meaning people.'"[3]

According to Naccinārkkiniyar in the compound "Makkaṭcuṭṭu' — cuṭṭu means, that which is valued and it stands as 'ākupeyar' referring to people and 'Makkaḷ' here does not stand as ākupeyar. It is only an attribute. But the compound — "veḷḷāṭai" is aṉmoḷittokai, based on paṇputtokai. Here it refers to the person who is wearing a white dress and consists of two words — Veṇmai (white) and āṭai (dress).[4]

(2) *Peyar and uri*: There are certain words about which itis difficult to say whether they are peyar (noun) or uri.

uru	—	fear.
kuru	—	colour.
Mallal	—	richness.

These words, though they seem as peyar (nouns) they are uri, different from peyar. Naccinārkkiniyar brings out their difference.[5]

1. Tol. Col. Cēnā; s. 114.
2. Ibid; s. 1.
3. Tol. Col; s. 1, pp. 5-6.
4. Ibid; s. 1, pp. 5-6.
5. Tol. Col; s. 299.

Peyar (*nouns*)	*uri.*
1. take final suffixes and mean many things	They are single units, and as they are, describe the quality of a thing.
2. take case signs	do not take suffixes etc.
3. Independent	attached to nouns and verbs thus depending for their existence on others
4. denoting the thing.	describing the quality of the thing.

(3) *Uraiyacai and acainilai:* Acainilai is mentioned by Naccinārk-kiniyar as one of the various kinds of 'Iṭai-c-col' and he has not mentioned 'urai acai' there. So it is possible to consider that 'urai acai' is an aspect of 'acai-nilai', Tolkāppiyar refers to 'āṅka' (Iṭai-c-col) as 'urai acai'.[1] Naccinārkkiniyar extracts a meaning for this word.

Āṅka — aṅṅanē (like that)

So it is possible to differentiate between 'urai acai' and 'acai nilai' from a study of Naccinārkkiniyar. According to him urai 'acai' has the suggestion of a meaning.

e. g. 'āṅka-k-kuyilum mayilum kāṭṭi'

Acai nilai has no such suggestion of substantial meaning.

e.g. 'Iruṅkuyil ālum arō'[2]

5.4.3. *Differentiation of allomorphs*

If a word occurs in different meanings it is classified as 'pala poruḻ oru col' — a single word giving various meanings. This is so in grammar also, where a single word or morpheme refers to various grammatical points and Naccinārkkiniyar brings out their differences in a remarkable manner.

ān and in: 'ān' is the third case suffix and 'in' is the fifth case suffix. There are cāriyai — 'ān' and 'in' also. What is the difference between the case signs 'ān, in' and cariyai ān, in? Naccinā-rkkiniyar analyses this matter thoroughly.[3]

'ān', and 'in', if they are cariyai, will take case signs.

1. Tol. Col; s. 279.
2. Tol. Col; s. 281.
3. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 119, p. 127.

oru pāṟku oru paktu + āṉ + ku. āṉ—cāriyai,
ku — case sign.

Viḻaviṟku viḻa + iṉ + ku — iṉ — cāriyai.
ku — case sign,

But if they occur as case signs they will not take other case signs.

Poṉṉāṉ iyaṉṟa kuṭam 'āṉ — case sign.

Paṉṉiṉ iyaṉṟa kuṭam. 'iṉ — case sign.

5.4.4, *Homonyms of ambiguity resolved by grammatical category*

Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar also points out the differences in the word 'yār' standing at two grammatical situations.[1]

(1) *I yār.*	*II yār.*
1 Interrogative noun.	Interrogative verb (with the tense understood).
2. Corrupted form of yāvar	It is a full word without any corruption.
3. Occurs for the palarpāl (uyar tiṇai plural gender only)	Occurs in all the three genders of uyartiṇai.
Avar yār?	Avaṉ yār?
Avaṉ yār? } wrong.	Avaḷ yar?
Avaḷ yār? } wrong.	Avar yār ?

(2) *The words 'uṇṭu' and 'iṉṟu '*: Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar investigates the various forms of the words "uṇṭu' and 'iṉru'. 'iṉru' is the opposite of 'uṇṭu'. 'uṇṭu' occurs as affirmative in various grammatical situations and 'iṉṟu' can also occur similarly but in the negative. This is understood from Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar's commentary.[2]

1.Uṇṭu refers to the existence of a thing.

Iṉṟu refers to the non-existence of a thing.

Kutirai-k-ku-k-kompu iṉṟu·

(The horse has no horns).

---

1. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 172
2. Tol. Col; s. 222, 2. 227.

2. Uṇṭu refers to quality and occurs in affirmative.
   Iṉṟu refers to quality and occurs in negative.
   e.g. Ik kutirai-k-ku ekkālamum naṭai iṉṟu.
3. Uṇṭu — suggestive in the affirmative.
   Iṉṟu — suggestive in the negative.
   e.g. Ik kutiraik-ku-īṇṭu naṭai iṉṟu.

(3) *Paṇai and uṭaimai:* There are other instances also where Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar finds out the meanings of words — varying with reference to their grammatical category.

1. Paṇai — to increase - uri-c-col (adjective)
   Paṇai — bamboo - peyar (noun).[1]
2. Uṭaimai— the quality of possession - paṇpuppeyar.
   uṭaimai — the thing one has.[2] - peyar (noun).

He has also pointed out 'the various places where Maṇṇumaṅkalam, kaikkiḷai etc., occur.[3]

(4) *Poruḷ and Poruṇmai :* A single word in its natural form can refer to a particular grammatical idea and in its changed form can refer to something else. Poruḷ and Poruṇmai are two words to illustrate this and Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar interprets them in a different way, bringing out the subtle differences between them.[4]

	Poruḷ.	*Poruṇmai.*
1.	'ā' (cow)	The quality of cow,
2.	'ā' (cow) is transitory	The quality of cow is permanent.
3.	'ā' (cow) is visible to the eyes.	The quality is not visible.

5.4.5. *Homonyms of ambiguity resolved by Sandhi rules*

The same word has different rules in Sandhi, according to the meaning it has in the context. This is laid down by Tolkāppiyar in many places. For example

Cē + kōṭu = Ceṅkoṭu (here cē means a tree)
Cē + kōṭu = Cē-v-iṉ kōṭu (here cē means a cow).[5]

1. Tol. Col; s. 339.
2. Ibid; s. 215, p. 215.
3. Tol. Poruḷ; ss. 90: 10, 91:12, pp. 315, 325.
4. Tol. Col; s. 67.
5. Tol. Eḷuttu; ss. 278-279.

Naccinārkkiniyar on his own finds out other differences between words with reference to Sandhi, not referred to by Tolkāppiyar.

1. uḷakku + kuṟai

   uḷakkin kuṟai — uḷakku and less (Alvaḷi)

   uḷakkiṟ kuṟai — reduced from the measure (veṟṟumai).[1]

2. Irā + kākkai

   Irāa-k-kākkai — the crow that is not (Alvaḷi)

   Irākkākkai — the crow that is in the night (Veṟṟumai).[2]

3. Ā + iṭai)
) — Literary usage.[3]
   Āyiṭai)

Āyiṭai, meaning 'in that place' or situatian,occurs in prosody, but the change is not due to prosody and it is due to the Sandhi. The difference between these changes is investigated by Naccinārkkiniyar. According to him, the change due to Sandhi occurs in two words, and the change due to prosody occurs in a single word.

5.4.6. *Root morphemes differentiated*

Kariyan and Karumaiyan: The root morphemes for these words are kari and Karumai respectively. Naccinārkkiniyar differentiates these words in a very subtle way. When we say Kariyan — we refer to the person himself as "he who is dark in complexion" and hence 'kari' here is paṇpu or quality (colour), but 'karumaiyan' we mean "he who has darkness as his complexion" (referring to his possession of the quality) and it takes the 2nd case sign (karumaiyai uṭaiyavan) and so 'karumai' here is a thing of possession.[4] This is how Naccinārkkiniyar analyses the words and shows that what apparently seem similar are really not so.

5.4.7. *Suffix morphemes differentiated*

Perumai and Peruppu: Both these words are derived from the same root 'peru' meaning to grow thick or large, or big. But they have different morphemes, mai and Pu. According to Naccinārkkiniyar 'perumai' refers to quality (greatness) whereas 'peruppu' refers to the action of growing thick or large or big.[5] From this we can understand that 'mai' is the suffix denoting the paṇpu (quality) and 'pu' is the suffix denoting the toḻil (action).

---

1. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 167.
2. Ibid; s. 227.
3. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 208.
4. Tol. Col; s. 215, p. 216.
5. Tol. Col; s. 339.

5.5. *Superfluity or other sources for more ideas*

No grammar is final. Language has an infinity of constructions of sounds, morphemes and words all of which grammar tries to explain by its theory in a few finite generalisations taking into consideration only the forms available. Language is something growing from the point of view of time and extensive from the point of view of dialects and styles. Therefore the ancient grammarians never pretended to be extensive from these two points of view. They had said that new words with new forms of new meanings may gain almost universal currency and become approved as grammatical.[1] They had also stated that with the help of what they had stated as forms etc. One can explain with reference to the language of his times. This last statement is called "Pur̲an̲aṭai" and occurs at the end of the chapter or the book.

5.5.1. *The importance of superfluity*

But even when stating a generalisation or listing forms the ancient grammarians add the words pir̲a etc. (and others). This provides for exceptions to such rules. From this the commentators have established a convention or fiction so as to bring other exceptions and other generalisations which are found in the language studies within the four walls of ancient grammatical texts. The basis of this convention is clarification. Its usefulness is evident. It is much more convenient to have the exceptions to the rules collected under the respective rules themselves instead of under the last pur̲an̲aṭai sūtra at the end. Therefore the commentators hunt for some extra or superfluous words and explain that the extra word was used with the purpose of reminding the reader or commentator that the rule is not all comprehensive and that there may be exception following other rules. Thus the fiction.

5.5.2. *Superfluity — a fiction*

Phrases like "nin̲aiyuṅkālai" (when one thinks) may suggest that the author wants us to think and hunt for exceptions. But there are other words which may not suggest any such meaning. That is why we call this a fiction of interpretation when any extra word is made to give this suggestion. According to this fiction the fact of an existing word is enough for the purpose. Therefore there is no necessity to go into the meaning of such words. The view of the Indian Grammarians is that there should be no superfluous word in a grammatical text. Therefore the seemingly superflous words have

1. Tol. Col; s. 452.

to be interpreted in some such way. If this theory of interpretative fiction is understood, the attempts of the commentators to read their own generalisations and exceptions into the texts themselves, will not appear far-fetched or absurd.

5. 5. 3. *Terms like "ni<u>n</u>aiyuṅkālai"*

Suppose there are two or three ideas common about a particular thing, the author would take the most prominent and express it. Then he would use an expression "ni<u>n</u>aiyuṅkālai" ('as considered'). This might be apparently considered a superfluity but the commentator brings out the several meanings this word conveys. Nacci<u>n</u>ārkki<u>n</u>iyar interprets such places with very great skill bringing out his extensive knowledge of literature. Tolkāppiyar says "as one considers, the verb conveys the distinction of uyartiṇai and ak<u>r</u>iṇai in a sentence." In the sūtra there is a word "ni<u>n</u>aiyuṅkālai" which seems to be an unwanted word.[1] But the meaning of this is, there are several ways of denoting the distinction and the 'verb' is one of them. Nacci<u>n</u>ārkki<u>n</u>iyar analyses all these, and "ni<u>n</u>aiyuṅkālai" (as considered) is only to emphasise the best of the lot. Among common nouns not only the verbs but the nouns also convey the distinction, and there are places where the verbs do not convey this distinction.

(a) Cātta<u>n</u> vantā<u>n</u>. uyartiṇai.
Cātta<u>n</u> vantatu. ak<u>r</u>iṇai.

Here 'vantā<u>n</u> and vantatu, the verbs convey the distinctions. This is explicit as stated by Tolkāppiyar.

(b) Cātta<u>n</u> oruva<u>n</u> uyartiṇai.
Cātta<u>n</u> o<u>nr</u>u ak<u>r</u>iṇai.

Here the nouns oruva<u>n</u> and o<u>nr</u>u convey the distinction.

(c) Mulai E<u>l</u>untatu)
) the distinction is not known.
Mōvāy E<u>l</u>untatu)

Here even the verb is not able to convey the distinction.

According to Nacci<u>n</u>ārkki<u>n</u>iyar. Tolkāppiyar considers all these things and has said that the verb, conveying the distinction is the best. All the other ideas, Nacci<u>n</u>ārkki<u>n</u>iyar derives from the word "ni<u>n</u>aiyuṅkālai" in Tol. sūtram, which seems to be superfluous.

---

1. Tol. Col. s. 174.

Wherever Tolkāppiyar has used the terms like "ni<u>n</u>aiyuṅkālai," teriyuṅkālai", tēruṅkālai, colluṅkālai, etc., Nacci<u>n</u>ārkki<u>n</u>iyar has analysed them in this way.[1]

5.5.4. *The terms like "Iṭa<u>n</u>uṭaiya" ('There are places')*

Tolkāppiyar says "there are places (Iṭa<u>n</u> uṭaiya) where ī, tā, koṭu mean requesting one to give".[2] Cē<u>n</u>āvaraiyar analyses the word "Iṭa<u>n</u>uṭaiya" (there are places) in the sūtram and says it means that there are other places where these words occur in different meanings. This is conveyed by the phrase "Iṭa<u>n</u>uṭaiya". And Nacci<u>n</u>ārkki<u>n</u>iyar mentions those places where they occur in different meanings.

Ī-c-ci<u>r</u>aku	— the wings of bee (ī — bee)
Tā-v-il na<u>n</u> po<u>n</u>	— spotless (valuable) gold. (tā-defect).
koṭu-ṅ-kōl	— cruel rule. (koṭu — cruel).

There are many other words like Iṭa<u>n</u>uṭaittu, olvaḷi, takkavaḷi, celvaḷi, ākuvaḷi, etc. where Nacci<u>n</u>ārkki<u>n</u>iyar gives such interpretations.[3]

5.5.5. *The terms like "Teḷḷitu" (clear)*

The grammarian mentions generally the most common, and accepted usages prevalent in his time, and the commentator has to incorporate other usages to make the sūtra give a complete picture. Tolkāppiyar mentions the mixing up of case signs in the whole and its part and mentions two usages only.[4]

1. If 'atu' occurs in the whole 'ai' occurs in the part.
   e.g. yā<u>n</u>aiyatu kōṭṭai-k-ku<u>r</u>aittā<u>n</u>.
2. If 'ai' occurs in the whole 'kaṇ' occurs in the part.
   e.g. yā<u>n</u>ai-y-ai-kōṭṭi<u>n</u> kaṇ ku<u>r</u>aittā<u>n</u>.

The author uses the word 'teḷḷitu' (clear) in this connection. Nacci<u>n</u>ārkki<u>n</u>iyar says that there are other examples also.

'ai' occuring at both the whole and its part.
e.g. yā<u>n</u>aiyai-k-k-kōṭṭai-k-ku<u>r</u>aittā<u>n</u>.

---

1. Tol. Eḷuttu; ss. 169, 283, Col; s. 405, Poruḷ; s. 227, etc. ('ni<u>n</u>aiyuṅkālai'). Tol. Eḷuttu; ss. 22, 260 ('tēriyuṅkālai'). Poruḷ; s. 14 (tēruṅkālai') Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 199 (colluṅkālai).
2. Tol. Col; s. 444.
3. Tol, Eḷuttu; ss, 232, 261. 300, 114, 246, 270, 311, 312, 372, 404,457, etc, Tol. Col; ss. 294, 444, 273, etc. Tol. Poruḷ; ss. 75, 91, 102, etc.
4. Tol. Col; s. 89.

He also refers to another idea. This mixing up — occurs not only in the whole and its part, but in quality, action and continuity.

Naccinārkkiniyar brings out all these things from the word 'Teḷḷitu in the sūtram. There are other words like Teṟṟanṟaṟṟē, cevvitu, mānamillai, vaḷukkinṟu, nāṭṭalvaliya etc. where he has given such interpretations.[1]

5.5.6. *The phrase like 'innapiṟa' (such like)*

The author, after mentioning one usage, may refer to the other kinds of usages by employing some phrases like "inna piṟa" meaning "such like as" etc. Tolkāppiyar, after listing all the suffixes of the seventh case, uses the phrase "and such like" (Innapiṟa).[2] Naccinārkkniyar mentions them all

Examples	*other suffixes*
Kuṭattil viḷakku	il
Ūrilé iruntān	ilē
kiḷavōḷ tēettu	tēem
kiḷavi māṭṭu	māṭṭu

He has thus analysed the word 'piṟa' (others) at other places.[3]

5. 5. 7. *Superfluity from previous sūtra*

Naccinārkkiniyar sometimes finds that there is no extra word in a particular sūtra to allow him to include further rules by suggestion, when necessary. But he finds an extra word in a previous sūtra relating to the same subject matter and the additional rules or exceptions which he wants to point out are implied in such extra word. In the words denoting numbers when they take the case signs, the short 'u' at the end will have an addition of 'an' in between the noun and the case signs.

e.g. onṟu + ai=onṟanai
irantu + ai=irantanai

But Naccinārkkiniyar is aware of the currency onṟinai, irantinai (having an addition of 'in' instead) etc. But Tolkāppiyar's sūtra explicitly says.

"Eṇṇin iṟuti annoṭu civaṇum"[4]

---

1. Tol. Eḷuttu; ss. 133, 295, 342; Tol. Col; ss. 141, 403.
2. Tol. Col; s. 83.
3. Tol. Col; ss. 62, 111, 176, 216, 284, 416. Ṭol. Poruḷ; ss. 18, 95, 102, 111, 150, 152, 212.
4. Tol Eḷuttu; s. 198.

Here there is no superfluous word. But Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar brings the word, 'ceyar̲kaiya' from the previous sūtra which is superfluous there and says that this superfluity in the previous sūtra suggests this point i.e. having instead of 'an̲' addition of 'in̲' as on̲r̲in̲ai, iran̲t-in̲ai, mūn̲r̲in̲ai, etc.

5.5.8 *Repetition as superfluity*

Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar also investigates those places where Tolkāppiyar has apparently repeated himself. Whenever the common noun and demonstrative occur in a sentence with a common predicate, the common noun must come first to be followed by the demonstrative nouns. This is clearly enunciated by Tolkāppiyar.[1] Here Tolkāppiyar has said, "the demonstrative noun will not precede the common noun, but will succeed it". "Will not precede" is sufficient enough, and 'will succeed' is superfluous. But according to Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar, it is not superfluous. He derives one more interpretation out of this apparent superfluity. He adds this is applicable to both uyartiṇai and akr̲iṇai.

1. Nampi vantān̲, avar̲ku-c-cōr̲u koṭukka.
   (Nampi came, give him food)
   Naṅkai vantāḷ, avaṭku-p-pū-k-koṭukka
   (The lady came, give her flower). } uyartiṇai.

2. Erutu vantatu atar̲ku-p-pul iṭuka.
   (The bull came, give it grass).
   Kutirai vantatu atar̲ku mutirai koṭukka.
   (The horse came, give it grain.) } akr̲iṇai.

5.5.9. *Synonyms as superfluity*

There are places where the author, instead of using one word to denote a thing, may employ two words with same meaning. Where one word is enough the second is a superfluity, but the commentator derives more ideas from the same. The words with vowel and consonantal endings in uyartiṇai, if they are succeeded by surds in alvaḻi and vēr̲r̲umai, will have no change.[2]

1. Vowel ending. Nampī + kur̲iyan̲ Nampi kur̲iyan̲ Alvaḻi
   Nampi + kai Nampikai Vēr̲r̲umai.

---

1. Tol. Col; s. 38.

2. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 153.

2. Consonant ending. Avan̲ + kur̲iyan̲ Avan̲ kuriyan. Alvaḷi.

Avan̲ + Kai Avan̲ Kai Ver̲r̲umai

Tolkāppiyar uses the word 'uyir īr̲u' and 'puḷḷi īr̲uti'. (vowel ending and consonantal ending). Here he uses, two different words īr̲u and īr̲uti which mean the same thing and it leads to more ideas according to Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar, So, he says, sometimes they will have change also.

Kapilan̲ + Paraṇan̲ Kapilaparaṇar.

Chapter - 6

CONVENTIONAL DEVICES OF INTERPRETATION

6.1. *Pan̲mai Kūr̲al* : (*Implication of the plural form*)

The grammarian sometimes employs the plural form of predicate when the subject is apparently singular. This gives an opportunity for the commentator to include other forms etc. which are found in literature, though not mentioned in the sūtrams. As the grammar, written centuries earlier, does not cover the new forms that come to stay, the commentator exploits such plural forms of predicates to his advantage.

6.1.1. *Agreement with his predecessors*

Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar not only agrees with the additions mentioned by his predecessors in their commentaries, but, he on his own introduces other forms which he has noted. Let us see an instance where he first agrees with his predecessors in mentioning the changes. Tolkāppiyar referring to the eighth case, says, "Viḷi en̲appaṭupa".[1] This plural form is interpreted as including four kinds of viḷi forms.

1. The form where the final sound of the noun has changed.
2. The form where the penultimate sound is lengthened.
3. The form with an emerging sound.
4. The form with no change.

Iḷampūraṇar and Cēn̲āvaraiyar mention all the four forms and Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar also gives the same list.

6.1.2. *Further implications suggested*

Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar, who mentions the listing of changes introduced by preceding commentators, also refers to others that have come to stay by his period. Tolkāppiyar mentions 'Atu' as the suffix for the sixth (genitive) case.

---

1. Tol. Col; s. 120

"...................itaṉatu itu eṉum
Aṉṉa Kiḷavi-k-kiḷamaittu atuvē".[1]

Here "Aṉṉa Kiḷavi" means "those things". 'Aṉṉa' is interpreted as a plural form. The case suffix mentioned is 'atu' which means "that which belongs to (this)". The author mentions only one case sign, one grammatical meaning as exemplified by the one pattern of construction for the genitive. If so, how can the plural 'aṉṉa kiḷavi' be justified? There is another case sign for the genitive namely 'a'; Iḷampūraṇar mentions this but states that though Tolkāppiyar has not specifically mentioned it, since he uses the plural 'aṉṉa', he according to the commentator, should be contemplating more than one case sign, and grammatical meanings. Therefore he must have been having in mind the case sign, 'a' and its grammatical meaning of plurality. The examples are "avaṉa, avaḷa" where 'a' is the plural genititive case suffix.[2] Cēṉāvaraiyar's examples are "Itaṉa ivai" (neuter gender).[3] Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar not only mentions all these forms, but because of the plural 'aṉṉa', includes another singular suffix 'ātu' used by his time.

6.1.3. *Different implications suggested*

Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar sometimes differs from the view held by his predecessors as is evident from his interpretation of the sūtram:

"Nīṭṭam vēṇṭiṉ avvaḷapuṭaiya
Kūṭṭi eḻūutal eṉmaṉār pulavar".[4]

Here 'avvaḷapuṭaiya' is a plural form. According to Iḷampūraṇar the plural form is used to include the long vowel as well as the short one end 'aa' which should be pronounced with no strain, in between the sounds.[5] There are other places where time-unit might exceed three mātrais, and to denote it, another short vowel also is written indicating the increase. For example "Ceṟāaay vāliya neñcu". He also quotes another grammatical work (Māpurāṇām) to justify this usage. Naccinārkkiṉiyar therefore holds the view that the plural 'avvaḷapuṭaiya' refers also to plurality of the short vowels included to denote the time-units (mātrias). Such as 'āaa' etc. when required by metre. This explains the special feature of 'aḷapeṭai' - having more than three mātrais which had not been explained by Iḷampūraṇar as an implication of this sūtram.

1. Tol. Col; s. 80
2. Tol. Col. Iḷam; s. 76
3. Tol. Col. Cēṉā; s. 79
4. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 6
5. Tol. Eḻuttu. Iḷam; s. 6

6.1.4. *Naccinārkkiniyar's own original implications*

He also analyses the plural forms in the sūtrams, which have not been investigated by preceding commentators. Tolkāppiyar refers to the separation of the hero from the heroine to serve the state in times of political hostilities. The hero or the king sometimes goes alone on a warlike mission. At other times he is accompained by others. The sūtram is,

"Tānē cēralum tannoṭu civaniya
Ēnōr cēralum vēntan merrē".[1]

Here 'enōr' is plural, meaning others. The king is usually accompained by the chieftains and occasionally, as pointed out by Nacci nārkkiniyar through literary usage, by kinds of equal status. He therefore says that this 'ēnōr' (others) refers to the chieftains, as well as to the kings of equal status.

6.1.5. *Interpretation in terms of literary usage*

There are other places where Naccinārkkiniyar analyses these plural forms in terms of the literary usage he has come across but not noted by others. Tolkāppiyar says 'Arattoṭu nirral' is of seven kinds.[2] It means the companion of the heroine revealing to the foster mother (cevili) the heroine's premarital love towards the hero and it is of seven kinds i.e. the speech of the companion arises in seven different forms. The subject is "arattoṭu nirral", but the predicate is "eluvakaiya" which is in plural. Why should there be this plural, if the said speech can be of any one of these ? Naccinār-kkiniyar has found in Kalittokai an instance, where the speech seems to contain more than one of these. Because of this, according to him, Tolkāppiyar has used the plural "vakaiya" and not the singular vakaiyatu".

6.1.6. *Plural denoting the forefathers*

Tolkāppiyar mentions the music sung by 'cūtar' to waken the king in the morning in the war camp. There, the king is referred to in the plural: 'kiṭantōr' (those who sleep)[3]. Here there is only one king sleeping but the plural form is used. Perhaps the other kings who have gone to assist the king in his mission are also referred to by "kiṭantōr". But Naccinārkkiniyar feels that only the king could stay in his bed-room and he justifies the plural usage in a

1. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 27
2. Tol. Poruḷ; 207.
3. Tol. Poruḷ: s, 91: 1-2.

different way. The practice of awakening the kings by 'cūtar' has been taking place from time immemorial and so according to Naccinārkkiniyar, when Tolkāppiyar refers to 'kiṭantōr' he has in mind all those forefathers whom he represents. This is because the glories of the forefathers are usually attributed to the present king.

6.1.7. *Unwarranted interpretation*

Naccinārkkiniyar at times brings his literary scholarship to justify the plural usuage, but sometimes we are hardly convinced. Tolkāppiyar sanctions the companion of the heroine referring to the various parts of the body of the lady as the former's own.

"Emmeṉa varūum kiḻamait-tōṟṟam
allāvāyiṉum pulluva uḷavē".[1]

Here 'tōṟṟam', means 'the parts of the lady' and it is a plural subject and 'uḷa' (are) is plural predicate. The commentator says, as the author has used "uḷa" a plural form, it means that not only the companion but the heroine can also occasionally speak in that fashion. It is difficult to understand how this plural form can mean the thing what Naccinārkkiniyar has in mind. The author refers to all the anomalies in Poruḷiyal and in this connection "this recognised anomaly aims at the identification by the maid with her own, the features or the different parts of the lady-love".[2] The reason which Naccinārkkiniyar gives for the usage of plural form is far-fetched. He, perhaps, derives a plural predicate 'kūṟuvaṉa' (that are said) before 'uḷa' and this might justify his interpretation that the heroine can also occasionally speak in that fashion.

But this is hardly necessary. Tolkāppiyar does not refer either to the heroine or her companion apparently and hence it is possible to consider the sūtram as applicable to both. Naccinārkkiniyar himself interprets such sūtrams, where Tolkāppiyar has generalised certain things in this fashion.[3]

6.2. *Kūṟiyatu Kūral* (*Repetitions*)

If the same idea is repeated again and again, it is considered to be one of the ten defects mentioned by Tamil Grammarians.[4] Tolkāppiyar, who prescribes the avoidence of such defects,

1. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 221.
2. Tol. Poruḷ. English Translation; Vol. I—Part II; p. 493.
3. Infra; pp. 196-197.
4. Tol. Poruḷ; Iḷam; s. 654. Naṉṉūl; s. 12.

seemingly appears to have committed this defect of repetition at certain places. But the commentator points out that the sūtram has no such defect, by analysing the significance of such repetitions and bringing out the subtle differences between the first statement and the later ones. Naccinārkkiniyar agrees mostly with his predecessors but often adds something of his own.

6.2.1. *No repetition*

Tolkāppiyar mentions that 'n̲' is the last letter in the alphabetical system, at two places.[1] Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar explains that the first sūtram refers to 'n̲' as the last letter among the thirty letters (vowels and consonants) and the second sūtram refers to 'n̲' as the last letter among the eighteen consonants. So, according to him, there is no repetition, as the two sūtrams refer to different groups and not the same group.[2] There are other places also where Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar justifies the repetition in this manner :

Sūtrams.	Repetition	Distinction brought out by Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar
1.	2.	3.
Tol. Eḻuttu (1) 18, 106.	In uyirmey the consonant precedes the vowel.	S. 18 refers to uyirmey as a category. S. 106 refers to uyirmey as occuring in a word.
(2) 103, 108	In a word, only the two letters i.e. the consonant or the vowel can occur intially and finally.	S. 103 refers to words standing alone. S. 108 refers to words occuring in Sandhi.
(3) 82, 83.	The word 'kaṇ'.	S. 82 refers to the case sign. S. 83 refers to one of the varied grammatical meanings of that case sign.

6.2.2. *Repetition for emphasis*

Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar also proves that the repetition in some places is for emphasis. Tolkāppiyar, in one of his sūtrams, says that the

1. Tol. Eḻuttu; ss. 1,9.
2. Ibid; s. 9.

vinaikkurippu actually by implication denotes tenses. He repeats the same in the succeeding sūtram also.

> "Am mukkālam kurippoṭum koḷḷum"[1]
>
> "Kurippinum Vinaiyinum.........
> Kālamoṭu varūum vinaiccol ellām"[2]

Naccinārkkiniyar justifies the repetition saying that this repetition is for emphasising the idea i.e. Vinaikkurippu also denotes the tenses.[3]

6.2.3. *Repetition for clarification*

Naccinārkkiniyar gives another reason for this repetition to afford clarification if there are doubts. Tolkāppiyar says that the letters consonants have dots, and he mentions this in two places. In Sandhi the words are classified thus :-

1.	Maram	—	consonant beginning, consonant ending.
2.	Ilai	—	Vowel beginning, vowel ending.
3.	Āl	—	Vowel beginning, consonant ending.
4.	Viḷa	—	Consonant beginning, vowel ending.

This classification is necessary to understand Sandhi rules. But there may arise a doubt if in the word Maram (during Sandhi) the initial is a consonant; whether that letter is also denoted with a dot according to Tolkāppiyar's rule:

> "Meyyin iyarkai puḷḷiyoṭu nilaiyal"[4]

According to Naccinārkkiniyar, Tolkāppiyar clarifies that only the consonant ending has the dot and not the consonant beginning and this clarification is given in the other sūtram:

> "Meyyīrellām puḷḷiyoṭu nilaiyal"[5]

So the first sūtram refers to the form of the consonant occurring independently, and the next sūtram refers to the form of the consonant occurring in a word.

6.2.4. *Repetition with a purpose*

Naccinārkkiniyar finds another justification for 'repetition'. According to Tamil Grammarians, repetition, sometimes, will suggest

1. Tol. Col; s. 202.
2. Ibid; s. 203.
3. Tol. Col; s. 203.
4. Tol. Eḷuttu s. 15.
5. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 104.

some other ideas in addition to the idea given by the author in his sūtram,[1] when it will be "anuvāda" and not repetition.[2] Naccinārkkiniyar endorses this opinion and investigates some of the repetitions in Tolkāppiyam. For instance

Tolkāppiyar says that 'Tokai' is treated as a single word. He mentions this at two places. In the first instance he says that if two nouns in succession go to make a tokai (compound) which becomes like one word they have a predicate.[3] He again states that the tokai behaves like a single word.[4] This seems to be unnecessary repetition. According to Naccinārkkiniyar this repetition suggests some other ideas in addition to the thing mentioned by Tolkāppiyar in the former sūtram. The first mention confines itself to its taking the predicate whereas the second one suggests various other features of this tokai.[5] They are:-

(1) Tokai formed of nouns will take the case sign.
Example: "yāṉai-k-kōṭṭai-k-kuṟaittāṉ".

(2) Tokai formed of noun and verb will have a noun predicate.
Example: "Nilaṅkaṭantāṉ Cāttaṉ".

(3) Tokai occurring as verbal participle.
Example: "Mā ūrntu pōyiṉāṉ"

(4) Tokai occurring as a relative participle.
Example: "Mā ūrnta Cāttan".

6.2,5. *Repetition-Naccinārkkiniyar differing from others*

The reasons for repetition are different according to the different commentators. Iḷampūraṇar and Naccinārkkiniyar do not have identical views regarding the repetitions found in Tolkāppiyam. Uḻiñai-t-tiṇai (the attack of the fort) having its eight constituent kinds has been referred to by Tolkāppiyar twice.[6] There are views that the constituents of uḻiñai are eighteen and twenty nine and according to Iḷampūraṇar, Tolkāppiyar repeats this to uphold and emphasise only his view.[7] But Naccinārkkiniyar holds a different

1. Tol. Poruḷ. Pērā; s; 663, p. 714:
2. Tol. Col. Cēṉā s. 10.
3. Tol. Col s. 68.
4. Tol. Col. s. 420.
5. Ibid.
6. Tol. Poruḷ; ss. 66, 67.
7. Tol. Poruḷ. Iḷam; s. 67, 68.

view. A king who attacks the fort of an enemy, sometimes, sends his associates viz. another king or his commander-in-chief to attack the fort of the enemy's associates. There also, the uḻiñai occurs in its eight different aspects. Tolkāppiyar in his first mention refers to the main war of uḻiñai and in the second, the second front of uḻiñai the king has formed.[1]

6.2.6. *Repetition in a single line*

Sometimes the repetition may be found in the same line of the sūtram. Tolkāppiyar, when he classifies all the forms of loss indicating transitoriness of things, mentions the following:

"Kātali Iḷanta taputāra nilai"[2]

It means 'the loss of wife known as the loss of wife condition'-the repetition is obvious. Naccinārkkiṉiyar investigates this and gives three reasons for this repetition:

1. A man who has no wife strictly satisfies the conditions of 'taputāranilai', yet it does not involve a specific loss (transitoriness).

2. Even after the loss of wife, a man may marry again, but this cannot fall under this category.

3. Taputāranilai is a technical term and "kātali iḷanta" is an explanation. In the explanation of technical terms tautology is inherent.

6.3. *Etiramaṟuttukkūṟal* (*arthāpatti*)

A sūtram in grammar should be brief, precise, intensive and offer wide scope for interpretation.[3] The commentator not only brings out what is broadly outlined in the sūtram, but looks for what is not specifically stated in it. When a statement is made with reference to one of two possibilities it has to be inferred that the rule does not apply to the other possibility i.e. its opposite. Tol. Col. Sūtram 61 is interpreted as justifying such an interpretation. For example, when it stated that Karikālaṉ was the greatest among the early Cōlās, it follows that none of the other cōlās of that period was as great as Karikālaṉ. Tolkāppiyar also in giving the list of faultless features, simply states that all opposites of the faults enumerated are faultless features.[4] Iḷampūraṇar exploits this method to

1. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 67, p. 205.
2. Tol. Poruḷ. ss. 79; 28, p. 277.
3. Tol. Poruḷ. Iḷam; s. 646.
4. Toḷ. Poruḷ. Iḷam; s. 655.

a greater extent in interpreting Tolkāppiyam and Naccinārkkiniyar follows broadly this commentator.[1]

6.3.1. *Independent observations of Naccinārkkiniyar*

But there are places where Naccinārkkiniyar makes his own independent observations. Tolkāppiyar says that 'y' and 'ñ' as initial of verbs succeeding the final 'ṇ' or 'ṉ' of a previous word are in free variation.[2]

Maṇ yātta — Maṇ ñātta

Poṉ yātta — Poṉ ñātta

'Yātta', here, is a verb and it does not differ in its meaning even if it occurs as ñātta. Naccinārkkiniyar says that as they are similar in the verbal sense they are not so in the nominal sense. They do not occur as,

Maṇ yāmai — Maṇ ñāmai

Poṉ yāmai — Poṉñāmai

6.3.2. *Differs from Iḷampūraṇar*

There are instances where Naccinārkkiniyar differs from Iḷampūraṉar. Tolkāppiyar says that Viyaṅkōḷ viṉai (optative mood of verbs) occurs in the sense of command (Ēval kaṇṇiya viyaṅkōḷ).[3] Iḷampūraṇar argues that since Tolkāppiyar says Viyaṅkōḷ viṉai occurs in the sense of command it can occur in other sense also (val kaṇṇāta viyaṅkōḷ) and Naccinārkkiniyar agrees with him, but the illustrations they give have different implications. Iḷampūraṇar's example-

'Maṉṉiya Peruma-nī-' "May you live long! you great one".

Here 'live' occurs in the sense of optative mood but it is not a specific order. The poet does not imply that the king to whom he has addressed this remark to carry out the order, as this is different from saying "go there" when the order is specific, asking the person to go, whereas "living long" is a happening wished by the poet and delivered in the sense of optative mood. This is the interpretation of Iḷampūraṇar and he calls this kind of viyaṅkōḷ "Ēval kaṇṇāta viyaṅkōḷ".

1. Tol. Eḻuttu; ss. 1, 49, 84.
2. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 146.
3. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 210.

Naccinārkkiniyar says that the command "go there" addressed to akṟiṇai (inferior category) is Viyaṅkōl viṉai not meant in the sense of command to be carried out (Ēval kaṇṇāta viyaṅkōl). When one addresses a dog 'go there' neither one does not mean that the dog should immediately obey such an order nor does the dog think of carrying it out. So Naccinārkkiṉiyar says that though this is in a sense a command in form, it does not have that as its implication (Ēval kaṇṇāta viyaṅkōḷ).[1]

But this view of Naccinārkkiṉiyar is not correct. Though animals may otherwise understand their masters, they do not understand the language as such and therefore it is Viyaṅkōḷ implication, but the speaker uses the language even in such cases. If inanimate things are addressed as in the literary convention where the lady love speaks to the clouds, mountains, forests, etc. one has to admit the use of language and also the use of viyaṅkōḷ. It is clear that Naccinārkkiṉiyār's explanation does not fully cover these cases of akṟiṇai (the inferior category) because in such cases the speaker does have in mind the viyaṅkōḷ meaning.

6.3.3. *Differing from Cēṉāvaraiyar*

Naccinārkkiṉiyar almost quotes Cēṉāvaraiyar in his interpretation of Collatikāram sūtrams exploiting this method of drawing out meanings.[2] There are one or two places where he has differed from Cēṉāvaraiyar.

Iṭai-c-coṟ kiḷaviyum uri-c-coṟ kiḷaviyum
Avaṟṟu vaḻi maruṅkiṉ tōṉṟum eṉpa.[3]

Here Iḷampūraṇar and Cēṉāvaraiyar interpret that Iṭai-c-col and uri-c-col always stand adjacent to the nouns and verbs though standing separate from them i.e. as external parts of noun and verb. But Naccinārkkiṉiyar says that they stand as internal parts of nouns and verbs.

Noun:	*Avaṉ*	— a = demonstrative	Iṭai-c-col-
		aṉ = suffix	
Verb:	uṇṭāṉ	uṇ = root	uri-c-col.

1. Tol. Eḻuttu; p. 198.

2. Tol. Col. ss. 51, 69, 120, 189, 235, 239, 240, 286.

3. Ibid; s. 161.

ṭ = tense suffix. Iṭai-c-col.
āṉ = suffix — Iṭai-c-col.

Naccinārkkiniyar further investigates and interprets thus : As it is stated there are nouns and verbs where the iṭai or uri comes as internal parts, one has to assume that there are nouns and verbs without these iṭai and uri. He gives the following examples. maram, maṇ, etc. (nouns), uṇ, tiṉ, etc. (verbs) which do not have their basis on iṭai and uri as they are indivisible.

6.3.4. *Natural and artificial regions and seasons*

In Poruḷatikāram Tolkāppiyar investigates 'Akam' under three classifications Mutal, Karu and Uri. Mutal consists of geographical Region and Season. He mentions this as

Mutal eṉappaṭuvatu nilam poḻutu iraṇṭiṉ
Iyalpu eṉa moḻipa iyalpuṇarn tōrē.[1]

Here 'iyalpu' means 'nature'. What Tolkāppiyar calls 'nature' is interpreted by Naccinārkkiniyar as referring to the region and season (natural). Discovering by implication the opposite of this statement referring to natural regions he says there are places and seasons which are artificial, or conventional what is attributed as natural to some tiṇai is taken as applicable to other tiṇais by convention or otherwise. Mullai (forest), Kuriñci (mountain), Marutam (agricultural tract,) and Neytal (Sea) are natural regions.[2] The seasons he has prescribed for all these four regions and Pālai are natural.[3] But Pālai, Kaikkiḷai and Peruntiṇai do not have geographical regions of their own and the latter two (Kaikkiḷai and peruntiṇai) do not have seasons of their own, but are in a way variations of the four main tiṇais. Pālai, being dependent upon the four tiṇais, has the region of others as its own and in the same way the other two also (Kaikkiḷai and Peruntiṇai get the region and season of the other tiṇais, as their own). So, according to Naccinārkkiniyar, the region of Pālai, Kaikkiḷai and Peruntiṇai and the season of Kaikkiḷai and Peruntiṇai are all artificial.[4] This classification is necessary, as the sūtram would be defective if it does not cover all the seven tiṇais.

6.3.5. *Interpretation on literary basis*

Naccinārkkiniyar sometimes investigates some of the sūtrams in Tolkāppiyam, bearing in mind literary references also. For example :

1. Tol. Poruḷ. s. 4.
2. Ibid; s. 2.
3. Tol. Poruḷ; ss. 6-11.
4. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 4 p. 16.

"Naṭuvu nilai-t-tiṇaiyē naṇpakal vēṉiloṭu
Muṭivu nilai maruṅkiṉ muṉṉiya neṟittē".[1]

This is 'time' prescribed for Pālai i.e. — Summer and noon. The second line seems to be superflous. But, for Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar this line does not seem to be unnecessary, and what is apparently superflous, gains importance in his hands. According to him 'nilai' means 'land' and 'maruṅku' means 'part'. 'Nilai maruṅku' means a part of the whole land, refers to Mullai (Forest) and Kuṟiñci (mountain). So he interprets the second line as meaning that the 'separation' prescribed for 'pālai' happens in Kuṟiñci and Pālai. Arguing through implication and negating the opposite, he holds that the separation does not happen in Neital and Marutam. This interpretation is necessitated by literary evidences. In literary works Pālai-t-tiṇai and its various aspects occur in Mullai and Kuṟiñci. The hero's decision to leave, the heroine's request to take her also with him and other aspects of Pālai or separation happen in Kuṟiñci and Mullai only and not in Marutam and Neytal. In Cilappatikāram there is a reference to Kuṟiñci and Mullai turning into Pālai[2] and hence Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar says that the separation occurs in Mullai and Kuṟiñci.

6.4. *Uyttukkoṇṭuṇartal (Interpretation by extension or Inference)*

Perhaps this is the best among the methods as enunciated by Tolkāppiyar. Here the commentator should stretch the scope of definition laid down by the grammarian, and fit in a new idea not specified by it. This is Pērāciriyar's interpretation of this method.[3] Iḷampūraṇar says that if a particular sūtram shows no application–apparently, it should be interpreted in a way that confines it to the area of application.[4] Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar follows the former interpretation of Pērāciriyar in this respect regarding the interpretation of this method.

6.4.1. *Second idea derived*

Tolkāppiyar has defined 'veṭci' in the following way:

Vēntu viṭu muṉaiñar vēṟṟu-p-pulak-kaḷaviṉ
Ā tantu ōmpal mēvaṟṟākum.[5]

1. Ibid; s. 9.
2. Cilappatikāram. kāṭu-kāṇ-kātai; 11. 64-66.
3. Tol. Poruḷ. Pērā; s. 665 : 23; p. 755.
4. Tol. Poruḷ Iḷam; s. 656: 23, p. 587.
5. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 57.

Naccinārkkiniyar interprets it as meaning the capture of cows (belonging to the enemy) by the king's commander and its protection. 'Veṭci in Tolkāppiyam includes both capture and retrieval. But the sūtram, as it is, contemplates those who capture the cows. Naccinārkkiniyar applying this method of interpretation makes it applicable to retrieval also: The phrase 'kaḷavin ā tantu ōmpal'–is interpreted in two ways:

1. Driving away the cows belonging to the enemy and protecting them.
2. Retrieval of the cows and protecting them.

So this proves that if the author mentions only one idea, the commentator by employing this skill of interpretation derives another meaning that lies hidden within the scope of the sūtram.

6.4.2. *Differing from Cēnāvaraiyar*

Cēnāvaraiyar interprets a sūtram by adopting a method known as 'yōka vipākam'. By this he interprets a phrase by splitting in two different ways and on its strength offers explanation. But Naccinārkkiniyar applies this method (uyttukkoṇṭuṇartal) to draw the meaning. The sūtram is:

"Vinaiyirrōnrum pālari kiḷaviyum
Peyarir rōnrum pālari kiḷaviyum
Mayaṅkal kūṭā tam marapinavē".[1]

According to the sūtra, the verbs and nouns should agree in gender and number in a sentence. 'Mayaṅkal kūṭā' means "they (the verbs or nouns) should not be in disagreement with other words in the sentence". "Tammarapinavē" means "they should be in agreement with other words". Both the phrases refer to the same idea in both the ways (i.e. negative and affirmative). But Cēnāvaraiyar splits "tammarapinavē" separately from the other and gives interpretation of this method which is called in Sanskrit 'yōkavipākam'. Naccinārkkiniyar adopts Uyttukkoṇṭuṇartal i.e. links up the word 'Tammarapinavē' with the other statement, then converts it into a separate phrase. Naccinārkkiniyar does not want to multiply the 'uttis' and therefore brings in the 'yōkavipākam' also under 'uyttu-k-koṇṭuṇartal'.

1. Tol. Col; s. 11.

6.4.3. *Explicit meaning derived*

Normally the commentator, after explaining what the author has to say explicitly, would then try to bring out the implied meaning by adopting this method "uyttukkoṇṭuṇartal". But Naccinārkkiniyar sometimes interprets the sūtram in a way that makes the implied meaning itself the main and obvious meaning and therefore explains what to others is the explicit meaning as if it is the implied meaning. For example:

"Oru Poruḷ iru col Pirivila varaiyār"[1]

"Scholars do not object to the use of the occurrence of two adjacent synonymous words". Ceṉāvaraiyar, the predecessor and Teyvaccilaiyār the successor of Naccinārkkiniyar both interpret the sūtram only in this natural way.[2] Their examples are:-

1. Nivantu ōṅku perumalai.
2. Mīmicai.

But Naccinārkkiniyar says that one word occurring with two meanings in a sentence can be sanctioned as it is beautiful (the phrase 'oru poruḷ iru col' is changed by him into "iru poruḷ oru col" to his advantage). His example is

"Kuḻal vaḷar mullai".

Here the words kuḻal aud mullai give double meanings.

1. The *'mullai-p-paṇ'* played by Āyar on the *flute.*
2. The *'mullai flower'* in the long and rich *hair-tresses* of the Āyar.

But he brings out this implied meaning as if it is explicit. The explicit meaning given by other predecessors is given by him as the second meaning of the sūtram, the meaning he says, he has derived by employing the method "uyttukkoṇṭuṇartal".

6.5. *Iraṭṭuṟa Moḻital (statement which is capable of two different meanings)*

Tolkāppiyar has not mentioned this method of literary appreciation as one of his 32 methods. But this method is found in later works on grammar.[3] According to Pēraciriyar, it seems, oppakkūṟal and Iraṭṭuṟa moḻital are the same.[4] Naccinārkkiniyar holds that

---

1. Tol. Col. s. 460.
2. Tol. Col; Teyva; s. 449.
3. Naṉṉūl; s. 14:6.
4. Tol. Poruḷ. Pērā; s. 665:9.

they are different. But he has not mentioned the difference between this method and the previous one i.e. uyttukkoṇṭuṇartal, as according to him, both are the methods through which two meanings are given for a sūtram. He approves of Iḷampūraṇar in some places accepting his interpretation through this method.[1] But he gives his own meaning at other places.

6.5.1. *The method referred to*

Tolkāppiyar has enumerated places where kāmakkiḻatti of the hero can speak out. The first line of the sūtram is:

Pullutal mayakkum pulavi"[2]

Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar finds two meanings for this phrase. "Pulavi"- sulky mood or bouderie. "Pullutal mayakkum" is an attribute. His two meanings are:

1. "When the mistresses feel the divided affection in the hero with respect to them and the lady-love".
2. "When they feel aggrieved on hearing the covert or secret union of the hero with the prostitute or harlot, carried on stealthily without their knowledge".

Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar finds the second meaning through the method viz., "Iraṭṭur̲a moḻital" and gives literary evidences. As usual it is these literary evidences which drive him to introduce these uttīs.

6.5.2. *The method not referred to*

There are places where Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar, though he draws two meanings from the same passage, does not mention that he has adopted "Iraṭṭur̲a moḻital" to draw the second inference. Tolkāppiyar enumerates the contexts where and when the companion of the heroine talks out. One of them is:

"Ompaṭaikkiḷavi"[3]

Here Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar interprets in two ways:

1. When the companion of the heroine tells the hero to take care of the heroine.
2. When the hero tells the companion of the heroine to take care of the heroine.

---

1. Tol. poruḷ; s. 103; p. 357.
2. Ibid; s. 151.
3. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 114: :25, pp. 478-479.

Here Naccinārkkiniyar does not mention specifically the method 'Iraṭṭuṟa moḻital.

6.6. *Oṉṟeṉa Muṭittal (Mentioning of Similarities)*

"Oṉṟeṉa muṭittal taṉṉiṉa muṭittal" is a method of literary appreciation mentioned in later works. This can be taken as a single method or as two.[1] Naccinārkkiniyar has the reading "oṉṟeṉa muṭittal" instead of "oṉṟiṉa muṭittal". He has exploited this method to interpret Tolkāppiyam at more than twenty places.[2] Oṉṟeṉa muṭittal means bringing all the similar literary practices within the scope of a particular sūtram which lays down the general rule for all of them.

6 6.1. *New ideas added*

(1) In Tamil, the passive voice is rarely used. It is idiomatic to use the active form of verb in the passive sense. "The house cleaned" is used in the sense of "The house was cleaned" and this active form in the passive sense is called "Karuma karuttā" (object as agent).[3] In this cnnnection Naccinārkkiniyar mentions some other usages in vogue in Tamil. The instrument of execution and the author of command also occur as the doer (Karuttā).

This sword attacks - instrument as agent.

The king built the temple - the master as doer.

These two ideas are added by Naccinārkkiniyar who uses the method "oṉṟeṉa muṭittal".

(2) Tīrtal and Tīrttal are used in the sense of 'viṭal' meaning 'separation', according to Tolkāppiyam.[4] Among these the first is intransitive and the next is transitive. The word 'viṭal' therefore occurs in both the senses. There are also other words such as pilattal, aṇaṅkal, etc. which can be used in both the intransitive and transitive senses. Naccinārkkiniyar here derives this idea employing the method "oṉṟeṉa muṭittal".

(3) In Tamil there are expressions where objects which cannot move are described as 'coming' and objects which do not have the capacity to think or speak are described as thinking and speaking.[5]

1. Naṉṉūl ; s. 14:19. Civañāṉa Swāmikaḷ commentary.
2. Tol. Eḻuttu; ss. 138, 177, etc. Tol. Col. 175, 236, etc. Tol. Poruḷ; 21, 68, etc.
3. Tol. Col; s. 248.
4. Ibid; s. 318.
5. Tol. Col; s. 422.

'The path comes here'.

'The crops have been asking for the rains'.

Naccinārkkiniyar, exploiting this method "onrena mutittal", adds a list of phrases that come under this category.

1. Kavavu akattiṭum — Here the meaning of the word is treated as its action.
2. Āyiram kāṇam vantatu — It is brought by somebody but here it means as if it came of its own.
3. Nīlam uṇṭa āṭai
4. Ipporuḷai iccol collum — and so on.

6.7. *Tannina muṭittal (Including others of the same category)*

Tannina muṭittal is "a mode of concise statement which, by implication, covers related points, one of 32 uttis".[1] If the author gives one definition, the commentator, exploiting this utti, applies the same to other things that can be affiliated to the main category enunciated by the author. What is mentioned is taken as illustrative and in that way all that belongs to that category can be included therein. Naccinārkkiniyar quotes his predecessor Iḷampūraṇar at many places.[2] But there are some places where he offers his own interpretations.

6.7.1. *Related points covered*

The consonant 'n' preceding the consonant 'm' has reduced time-length i.e. shorter than its normal $\frac{1}{2}$ mātrai.[3]

Example: Pōnm.

Naccinārkkiniyar, employing the above method, adds that the consonant 'ṇ' before the consonant 'm' will also have the same reduced time-length as in:

Example: Maruṇm,

Nouns of quality that have 'ar' 'ār' as suffixes take the vocative case signs 'īr' and 'ē'.[4]

Kariyar	—	Kariyīr	Kariyīrē
Iḷaiyār	—	Iḷaiyīr	Iḷaiyīrē

1. Tamil Lexicon; p. 1813.
2. Tol. Col; ss. 16, 62, 215, etc.
3. Tol. Eḻuttu s. 52.
4. Tol. Col. s. 142.

Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar, using this principle, adds that attributive compounds of two nouns, which have other suffixes, also take the same vocative case signs, after having the 'ar' or 'ār' suffix.

Cīvakacāmi — Cīvaka cāmiyār — 'ār' suffix.

Cīvakacāmiyīrē — īr and ē — vocative signs.

6.7.2. *Differing from Iḷampūraṇar*

Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar differs from Iḷampūraṇar at some places with reference to the — employment of this method. He includes the interrogative 'e' along with the demonstratives 'a', 'i', 'u', as Tolkāppiyar has not mentioned separately by this interrogative sign.[1] Iḷampūraṇar includes it with the other interrogatives 'ā, ē, ō.[2] Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar is of the opinion that as 'e' is a short vowel, it should be mentioned along with the demonstratives 'a' 'i' 'u' only; i.e. the iṭaiccol bases of short vowels, but according to Iḷampūraṇar as 'e.' is an interrogative he feels it should be mentioned with the other interrogatives and this seems more natural.

6.8. *Vēṇṭātu Kūṟal* (*Superflous Statements of Phrases*)

Sometimes the author may be guilty of making a statement which is unnecessary as it can be derived from his main statement. Repetition is repeating the same idea once more, whereas this involves an unnecessary remark. If one says, "I saw with my eyes" —those words succeeding 'saw' are unnecessary as it is possible to see only with the eyes. Parimēlaḷakar, the great commentator of Tirukkuṟaḷ, investigates the superflous phrases in Tirukkuṟaḷ such as "words from the mouth" and gives reasons for them in a beautiful manner.[3]

6.8.1. *Agreement with the predecessors*

In Tolkāppiyam, there are places where some of his statements seem unnecessary. Iḷampūraṇar justifies these statements analysing them in an ingenious way and exploits what seems to be a defect to incorporate new generalisation till then unnoticed. In almost all places, Cēn̲āvaraiyar and Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar agree with Iḷampūraṇar. Tolkāppiyar says that words ending in 'i', 'u', 'ai', 'ō' take the vocative case suffix.[4] It means that words with other vowel endings

---

1. Tol;. Eḻuttu; s. 31.
2. Tol. Eḻuttu. Iḷam; 32.
3. Kuṟaḷ. Pari; vv. 91, 139, 1100.
4. Tol. Col; s. 122.

(eight vowels) will not take the vocative case suffix. This need not be mentioned as the first statement itself suggests the succeeding idea. But still Tolkāppiyar mentions this in another sūtram.[1] Iḷampūraṇar says that what seems to be unnecessary occurs only to suggest that whilst words other than these endings in 'i', 'u', 'ai' and 'ō' will never take any vocative case sign, the words ending in 'i' etc. will take not only the prescribed case signs but may take other vocative case signs also.

Kaṇi	—	Kaṇī	Tolkāppiyam.
Kaṇi	—	Kaṇiyē	Iḷampūraṇar.

Short 'i' will become long 'ī' according to the vocative rule of Tolkāppiyar. According to the view of Iḷampūraṇar, which he derives from the superflous statement of Tolkāppiyar, the short 'i' will also have 'ē' as the vocative suffix[2]. Both Cēṉāvaraiyar and Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar agree with Iḷampūraṇar and give the same examples in their commentaries.[3] There are many places in Tolkāppiyam where Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar agrees with Iḷampūraṇar, but gives more examples from his abundant literary experiences.[4]

6.8.2. *Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar's original suggestions*

Tolkāppiyar, in Poruḷatikāram, refers to 'Veṭci' a tiṇai which is the counterpart of Kuṟiñci in Akam.[5] Kuṟiñci has Kaḷavu (clandestine love between the hero and the heroine before marriage) as the trait peculiar to this Akattiṇai and in Veṭchi the clandestine way by which the cattle of the enemy is driven away for protection is described. So, it is enough if the grammarian says that Vetci in Puṟattiṇai is the counterpart of Kuṟiñci in Akattiṇai, but Tolkāppiyar explains this still further and uses the word 'Kaḷavu' once again,[6] which can be derived from his first statement making veṭci correspond to Kuṟiñci. Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar says this unnecessary statement suggests an important point. The trait of Kuṟiñci, Kaḷavu, the clandestine aspect, though peculiar to Kuṟiñci-t-tiṇai alone, does occur in all other tiṇais also, but the trait of Veṭci, Kaḷvau, the clandestine aspect, does not belong to other tiṇais in Puṟam like Vañci, tumpai, vākai, uḷiñai, etc. To emphasise this

1. Tol. Col. s. 126.
2. Tol. Col. Iḷam; s. 121
3. Tol. Col; s. 126, Tol. Col. Cēṉā; s. 124.
4. Tol. Eḻuttu; ss. 240, 320, 450.
   Tol. Col; ss. 27, 31.
5. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 56.
6. Ibid; s. 57.

view, the author has used the word 'kaḷavu' once again, according to Naccinārkkiniyar.

6.9. *Varaiyātu Kūral* (*Unrestricted*)

The grammarian has to define clearly the area of application for all the sūtrams, or else it would lead to ambiguity. We see Tolkāppiyar almost scrupulously following this procedure of setting limits for many sūtrams.[1]

6.9.1. *Agreement with predecessors*

But there are places where he has not clearly prescribed such limits. In such places Naccinārkkiniyar follows mainly his brilliant predecessor Iḷampūraṇar. Tolkāppiyar refers to the rule for sandhi of the word 'Maka' with another word and mentions the occurrence of the 'in' cāriyai (augment used in combination as of nouns and case endings.)[2] He has not defined what sort of words should succeed 'Maka' for the transformation. Iḷampūraṇar says that since no restriction has been given all kinds of letters can come.

1. Maka + Kai = Makavin kai — plosive.
2. Maka + ñāṇ = Makavin ñāṇ — nasal.
3. Maka + yāl = Makavin yāl — medials.
4. Māka + āṭai = Makavin āṭai — vowel.

Naccinārkkiniyar also mentions this in this commentary.

6.9.2. *Original additions*

Naccinārkkiniyar not only quotes Iḷampūraṇar at many places, but adds a few more things, not mentioned by Iḷampūraṇar. 'cē' is a word meaning cow and tree, When it has the meaning 'tree', it gets the 'in' cāriyai in Sandhi according to Tolkāppiyar, but he has not specified the succeeding word. Naccinārkkiniyar explains that it will get the 'in' cāriyai in sandhi with all the four groups of letters, because Tolkāppiyar has not placed any restriction on the words succeeding 'cē' meaning cow.[3]

1. Cē + kōṭu = Cēvin kōṭu plosive.
2. Cē + maṇi = Cēvin maṇi nasal.
3. Cē + vāl = Cēvin vāl medial.
4. Cē + imil = Cēvin imil vowel.

---

1. Tol. Eḻuttu: ss. 128, 151, 296, 340, 357, 409, 414, 430, etc.
2. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 218.
3. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 279.

Naccinārkkiniyar's own interpretations, where Iḷampūraṇar has offered none are found in many places in his commentary.[1]

6.10. *Potuppaṭakkūṟal (Generalization)*

If a particular definition is common to many categories, the author makes a general statement and from the generalization, the readers should conclude the area of its applicability. Naccinārkkiniyar is not only a critical grammarian, but has a rich literary background with wide reference, He excels himself when he brings out the area of applicability of such sūtrams.

6.10.1. *Uṟaḷum Kiḷavi*

Tolkāppiyar mentions two remarks relating to Akattiṇai.[2]

1. Uṟaḷum kiḷavi.
2. Aiya-k-kiḷavi.

Aiyakkiḷavi, "the words born of mental hesitation whether to speak or not to speak",[3] belongs to the hero, as specifically mentioned by Tolkāppiyar. But the other one, uṟaḷum kiḷavi, has not been specified as being restricted to anyone. Uṟaḷum kiḷavi is refutation or retort - Naccinārkkiniyar says, that this can be spoken by the heroine, the hero and the companion of the heroine. The importance of Naccinārkkiniyar's commentary lies in his illustrations justifying this 'uṟaḷum kiḷavi' not being restricted to any one character as 'aiyakkiḷavi' and in his classification as under:

1. The retort of the lady when the maid speaks out noble words.
2. The retort of the maid when the hero speaks out noble words.
3. The retort of the lady when the hero speaks out noble words.
4. The retort of the maid when the heroine speaks out noble words.[4]

.10.2. *Tiṇaimayakkuṟutal*

Let us give another example for this critical method of analysis. Tolkāppiyar says that the classification of 'Tiṇai' (Kuṟiñci, Mullai,

1. Tol. Eḻuttu; ss. 287. 324, 331, 375, 377, 402, etc.
2. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 238.
3. Tol. Poruḷ. English Translation; Vol. I. Part II. p. 536.
4. Tol. Poruḷ. Translation; Vol. I, Part-II; p. 536.

Marutam, Neytal and Pālai) is not water-tight, but there might be mingling of one with the other.[1] Tiṇai includes three constituents:

1. Mutal or the basic things - place and time.
2. Karu - the products of the particular place.
3. Uri - the aspect of love peculiar to each place.

Tolkāppiyar mentions the mingling of tiṇai and Naccinārkkiniyar includes there the mingling of the three above mentioned constituents, as tiṇai includes all these three. Here also this justification for the use of the general term is based on literary interpretation of Caṅkam literature and his classification of the commingling of tiṇai is also based on such interpretation.

6.11. *Moliyātutu Muṭittal (Mentioning what is not mentioned)*

The grammarian cannot list all the usages in vogue in his time, as that would make his work unduly long. But the commentator summarizes from the main instances given by the author and amplifies the scope of the work. Tolkāppiyar himself has sanctioned this as one of the methods of interpretation.[2] Naccinārkkiniyar broadly follows his predecessor at many places[3] but he has something to say of his own at one or two places.

6.11.1. *Importance of both the views*

If the word 'anru' succeeds the demonstratives atu, itu, utu - the vowel 'u' in the last syllable in the demonstratives, changes into long vowel 'ā'.[4]

atu+anru = atāanru.

Here Naccinārkkiniyar also mentions another practice prevalent in his period i.e. the vowel in the vowel consonant goes and the vowel 'a' in the succeeding word merges with the consonant as the following:

atu+anru = atanru

This is brought out by Naccinārkkiniyar. Tolkāppiyar has given one behaviour and left it to the commentator to complete the list by exploiting this method 'Moliyātatu muṭittal'. "Both the views of the author and the commentator are equally important, and if

1. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 12.
2. Tol. Poruḷ. Iḷam; s. 656; 5.
3. Tol. Eḻuttu; ss. 32, 101; Tol. Poruḷ; ss. 76: 7, p. 254.
4. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 258.

the commentator has not completed the list, the sūtram will be defective or incomplete,[1] as applicable to the other usages quoted by Naccinārkkiniyar.

6.12. *Oppakkūṟal (Mentioning of Parallels)*

This is also one of the methods which Tolkāppiyar has mentioned.[2] Iḷampūraṇar interprets this as codifying similar things though occurring in different contexts, under one heading. Pērāciriyar differs from Iḷampūraṇar and says that "what suggests two ideas is 'oppakkūṟal'.[3] Naccinārkkiniyar follows Iḷampūraṇar and this is evident from the explanation he offers for a Tolkāppiyam sūtram.

6.12.1. *Alar Kūṟutal between kaḷavu and kaṟpu*

'Alar kūṟutal' is common to both kaḷavu and kaṟpu and it is but natural to expect that they should be mentioned at both places as they occur in different contexts. But Tolkāppiyar has mentioned this in' Kaṟpiyal' only.[4] Here Naccinārkkiniyar says that Tolkāppiyar has mentioned this in Karpiyal only, to avoid repetition and has codified similar ideas under one heading. Iḷampūraṇar calls this as 'Tokuttukkūṟal' (Summarization and generalisation) whereas it also needs classification and specification.[5] It is clear that the same idea has been investigated by two different methods.

---

1. Tol. Poruḷ. Pērā; s. 665: 4-5, p. 733.
2. Tol. Poruḷ. Iḷam; s. 656; 9.
3. Tol. Poruḷ. Pērā; s. 665: 9. p. 739.
4. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 162.
5. Tol. Poruḷ; Iḷam; s. 160.

Chapter - 7

A CRITICAL REVIEW OF NACCINĀRKKINIYAR'S VIEWS

7.1 *A Study of Ākupeyar*

There are certain points elucidated perhaps for the first time by Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar with regard to Ākupeyar. Ākupeyar is "a name of word, which, by long usage, is secondarily applied to denote something connected with the thing originally denoted by it".[1] So ākupeyar has two meanings.

1. Original or primary meaning.
2. Applied or secondary meaning.

7.1.1 *Ākupeyar with an attribute*

Sometimes an attribute precedes the ākupeyar. Here it is important to determine whether it is an attribute for the original meaning of the word or for the applied meaning of the word. Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar investigates this function of the attribute and explains in a remarakable manner.

"Tūvi an̲n̲a men̲ cēkkai"[2]

Here 'an̲n̲am' is a noun with an attribute 'tūvi'. It (an̲n̲am) is an ākupeyar, because it refers to the bird (the whole) first and to the feathers (part) secondly. Anyhow, in this context, 'an̲n̲am' has its secondary meaning i.e. the feathers of the bird, because the poet here refers to the bed made of the feathers of a swan. Tūvi is the attribute which also means "the feathers." It is, therefore, clear that this attribute tūvi meaning 'feathers' cannot qualify the secondary meaning of 'an̲n̲am', i.e. the feathers. So Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar investigates this point and explains that the attribute 'tūvi' meaning feathers, does not go to describe the part i.e.the feathers, the secondary meaning of the word 'an̲n̲am', but it goes to describe the whole i. e. the bird 'swan', the primary or original meaning of the word 'an̲n̲am.

---

1. Tamil Lexicon; p. 207
2. Kali; v. 13: 15.

'Veṉṭirai' is also another ākupeyar in which, according to Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar, the attribute qualifies the original meaning of the word 'tirai' (waves).[1]

7.1.2 *Interpretation of aṭai aṭutta ākupeyar*

Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar's interpretation of this-'aṭai aṭutta ākupeyar' (Ākupeyar occurring with an attribute), is original. Vakarakkiḷavi is an ākupeyar with attribute, as kiḷavi is the ākupeyar and vakaram is its attribute. The original meaning of 'kiḷavi' is 'word'. Here as ākupeyar it 'refers'to the letter. The word 'vakaram', does not stand as an attribute to the "word" (the original meaning of 'kiḷavi'). The attribute does not go to describe the original meaning of the noun, but goes to describe its ākupeyar meaning i.e. the secondary meaning. Civañāṉamuṉivar says that this is the trait of ākupeyar with an attribute.[2] Though Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar and Civañāṉamuṉivar differ in their interpretations, they have referred to the two kinds of aṭai aṭutta ākupeyar.

1. attribute goes to the original meaning.
2. attribute goes to the secondary meaning.

7.1.3 *Ākupeyar occurring as an at tribute*

The word that stands occuring as ākupeyar not only does so with an attribute preceding it, but it occurs as an attribute as well. For example.

"Koḻuvalci"[3]

Koḻu is an agricultural weapon made of iron but here it refers to agriculture. So it is 'ākupeyar'. 'Koḻuvalci' means rice, the product of agriculture. So Koḻu, in its ākupeyar (secondary) meaning and not in its original meaning stands as an attribute to 'Valci'. This, according to Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar, can also be one of the aspects of ākupeyar.

7.1.4 *ākupeyar and its results (a) from the point of view of synonymy*

The various words that denote the same meaning have been classified in grammar as 'oru poruḷ paṉ moḻi' (synonyms). But because of the shifts in meanings of ākupeyar, which have also been well established, so many words look like synonymous, as understood from Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar's commentary.

---

1. Kali; v. 124: 2-3.
2. Tol. Cūttira virutti; p. 44.
3. Maturai; l. 141.

Word.	Original meaning.	Ākupeyar (secondary) meaning.
1. Pālai	Pālai melody.	Pālai yāḻ[1]
2. Kēḷvi	hearing.	yāḻ[2]
3. Toṭai	string of yāḻ.	yāḻ[3].
4. Kural.	sound, a melody.	yāḻ.[4]

Here according to later interpretations Pālai, Kēḷvi, and Kural, referring to the effcet of yāḻ, stand for yāḻ the cause, and hence 'kāriya ākupeyar', Toṭai, referring to the part of the yāḻ, stands for yāḻ, the whole, and hence Ciṉai ākupeyar.

7.1.5. *Ākupeyar and its results: (b) from the point of view of polysemy*

The various meanings that one word denotes as in its condition of ākupeyar have been also referred to by Nāccinārkkiṉiyar which we are able to understand from his commentary. The words, poṉ, poṟi, etc. as ākupeyar denote many meanings as under:-

Word	*Original meaning*	*Ākupeyar (secondary) meanings*
1. Poṉ.	gold.	1. jewels.[5]
		2. Mēkalai.[6]
		3. Pot.[7]
2. Poṟi.	engrave.	1. Wings of a peacock.[8]
		2. honour.[9]

7.1.6. *Ākupeyar-is it traditional?*

The commentator of Naṉṉūl distinguishes ākupeyar and aṉmoḻi -t-tokai, by referring to the fact that aṉmoḻi can be created as and when the occasion demands, but ākupeyar conforms to a traditional usage.[10] But it is clear, from his commentary, Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar

1. Porunar; 1. 22.
2. Perumpāṇ; 11. 15-16.
3. Paṭṭiṉam; 1. 254.
4. Malai; 1. 358.
5. Jīvaka: vv. 2295, 2598
6. Ibid; v. 67.
7. Ibid; v. 97.
8. Muruku; 1. 122.
9. Jīvaka; v. 1792.
10. Naṉṉūl; s. 290.

does not hold the same view, Any shift in meaning, whether it is new or old would be ākupeyar according to him.

	Words	*Original meaning*	*Ākupeyar meaning*
1.	Iṉpam.	pleasure.	good smell[1]
2.	Kuṇam.	quality.	action.[2]
3.	Tēr.	chariot.	charioteer.[3]
4.	Nīlam.	blue colour.	sacred grass (Taruppai).[4].
5.	Viraku.	skill.	cakes.[5]
6.	umiḻ.	spitting.	sound.[6]
7.	Cuṭar.	shining.	weapons.[7]
8.	Aṉpu.	love.	Jīvakan.[8]

These words occur as ākupeyar according to Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar only, and it is difficult to find out instances elsewhere in the literary works. But there are words as viḷakku, meaning light, referring to the base of lamp,[9] kaḻal, meaning anklet, referring to the feet,[10] varai, meaning border, referring to bamboo[11]-etc., coming in the traditional usage as 'ākupeyar'. But the words mentioned above have no traditional sanction. So Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar presumably holds that ākupeyar need not occur in a traditional way, but can be created as and when it is necessary like aṉmoḻi-t-tokai. "A single noun occurring as various ākupeyar" referred to in the previous page, also, proves this view of Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar.

7.1.7. *Ākupeyar-a forced interpretation*

Because he has left it to be assumed that any shift in meaning, understood in the context, can be ākupeyar, Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar strains

1. Jivaka; v. 1980.
2. Ibid; v. 2462.
3. Kali; v. 74:16.
4. Muruku; 1.253.
5. Porunar; 11, 107-108.
6. Muruku; l. 310.
7. Muruku; l. 105.
8. Jīvaka; v. 2176.
9. Neṭu; 11. 42, 175, Mullai; 1.85.
10. Jīvaka; vv. 2135, 2970.
11. Muruku; l. 12.

to interpret forcedly the nouns as ākupeyar, which are so well established only in that of primary sense.

"Nāḷum kōḷmiṉ takaittalum takaimē"[1]

It means 'stars and planets' in its original meaning. But Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar says 'kōḷ' means that which is held by the mind, and according to him it refers to the birds of ill omen and hence ākupeyar. This is far fetched. Nāḷ and kōḷ, occur as such, in literary works, meaning 'the stars and planets'. For example:

'Nāḷmiṉ Virāya kōḷmiṉ pōla'[2]

In this line, Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar himself interprets the phrase Nāḷ miṉ and kōḷmiṉ as meaning the "stars and planets". But he interprets the same phrase in the former example, otherwise. This phrase (nāḷ and kōḷ) like the phrase 'day and night', has become well-established as referring to things of the same order. In the phrase "day and night", the word 'day' cannot be separated from night and interpreted in a different way. Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar's interpretation is not in conformity with the spirit of the passages in devotional poems as

"Nāḷ eṉ ceyum......kōḷ eṉ ceyum"[3]

7.1.8. *Iyaṟ peyar or ākupeyar?*

Iyaṟpeyar means the nouns with their primary sense and ākupeyar means-the nouns suffering shift in meanings. Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar sometimes gets confused regarding the iyaṟ peyar and ākupeyar.

"Nakāar aṉṉa muttam"[4]

It means teeth-like pearls. Nakāar means teeth and it is a natural noun. The pearls are compared to the teeth of women here. Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar also does not refer to this as 'ākupeyar' at this place, but elsewhere in Kali-t-tokai he refers to 'nakāar' referring to the teeth of women as 'ākupeyar'.[5] It does not seem to be correct. It cannot be a natural noun at one place and 'ākupeyar' at another. When referring to 'pearls' perhaps 'nakār' can occur as ākupeyar.

7.1.9. *Participial nouns or ākupeyar?*

Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar sometimes calls even the participial nouns as ākupeyar. In Jīvakacintāmaṇi, there occurs a phrase:

1. Kali; v. 5:9.
2. Paṭṭiṉam; l. 68.
3. Kantaralaṅkāram; v. 38., p.11.
4. Ciṟupāṇ; ll. 56-57.
5. Kali; v. 93:18.

"Atar pōkkuva"[1]

It means "those which show the way", meaning, the lights. It occurs as a participial noun, those which show the way. Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar says that this, as it stands as a participial noun, is ākupeyar.

The verb, as it refers to the one enaged in that action, is a participial noun and it is a personal noun in the form of a finite verb.

Rāman̲ vantān̲ — Rama came.

Vantān̲ pāṭin̲ān̲ — He who came, sang.

Here 'Vantān̲' (came) is a verb in the first sentence. In the second sentence 'vantān̲' (he who came) refers to Rāman̲ as it denotes the one in that action of coming. Here 'vantān̲' is not ākupeyar because Vantān̲ Pātin̲ān̲, as such is a common participial noun referring to nobody in particular, unless the specific person it denotes is understood by the situation.

Perhaps Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar has in mind, 'vantān̲' is 'toḻil ākupeyar' where the action refers to the doer. Vaṟṟal, cuṇṭal etc. are treated as ākupeyar. Here also these words, meaning the action• refer to specific things, whereas vantān̲, pātin̲ān̲, ōṭin̲ān̲, etc. - do not have a specific scope. That which occurs generally cannot be called by a specific name. If it is so, all participial nouns are ākupeyar. Demonstrative nouns also, according to this, can be called ākupeyar. Also Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar should have scrupulously followed this, at other places, where he should have claimed participial nouns as ākupeyar.

Kaviḻtta	— the ornaments that were thrown.[2]
Kāṇpa	— the cranes that are seeing,[3]
Ularttuvār	— the women who were drying ..[4]
Tēṟṟāḷ	— one who is not consoled.[5]
Āken̲ṟān̲	— one who said he will become that.[6]

1. Jīvaka; v. 339.
2. Jīvaka; v. 35.
3. Jīvaka; v. 66.
4. Jīvaka; v. 127.
5. Ibid; v. 302.
6. Ibid; v. 1043.

Ēṟiṉāṉ — one who ascended or mounted.[1]

Vaṭiya — The eyes which liken the mango.[2]

Here is a list of participial nouns which Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar has not classified as ākupeyar and refers to as participial nouns. So his reference to 'atarpōkkuva' as ākupeyar seems to be incorrect.

7.1.10. *Are numerals ākupeyar?*

Wherever Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar refers to 'ākupeyar', we see that he quotes either Tolkāppiyam Sūtram or other literary occurrences.

"Āṟu aṟi antaṇar"[3]

This is a line in Kali-t-tokai. It means "The Brahmins who know the six". Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar says that the 'six' here refers to the 'six parts of the Vēdās', and hence 'ākupeyar'. In this connection he quotes a Tolkāppiyam sūtram, reminding us of what he interpreted there. He has interpreted there that numerals, as ākupeyar, denote the things.

"Nūṟṟulām manṭapam"[4]

This is a line in Jīvaka cintāmaṇi, Here also 'Nūṟu' (hundred) refers to 'hundred feet' and hence ākupeyar according to Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar. Here he quotes the above mentioned line in Kalittokai and does not refer to Tolkāppiyam.

Tolkāppiyar classifies some ākupeyar and also quotes some exceptions.[5] It can be inferred that the ākupeyar of numerical variety that Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar refers to is included by him in the category of exceptions mentioned by Tolkāppiyar. But Cēṉāvaraiyar is against this view, as he thinks that Tolkāppiyar, who has mentioned ākupeyar of measure and quantity, has specifically omitted this ākupeyar of numerical variety. According to him the numerals one, two, three etc. will also mean the things that are counted and so they are not ākupeyar.[6]

7.1.11. *Is there any basis for ākupeyar?*

There is another place where Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar refers to a kind of ākupeyar that is "ākupeyar on the basis of uvama-t-tokai".

---

1. Ibid; v. 2522.
2. Kali; v. 140:9.
3. Ibid; v. 1:1.
4. Jīvaka; v. 2734.
5. Tol. Col; s. 119.
6. Tol. Col. Cēṉā; s. 116.

"Nittila-p-pantu".[1]

pearl-ball is its meaning. Naccinārkkiniyar says it is like 'Gandharva Vaḻakkam'. There is another word 'mayil' (peacock) he calls uvamattokaiyin vanta ākupeyar i.e. ākupeyar on the basis of uvamattokai.[2] It is difficult to understand how these words could be called 'tokai' (compound). Pearl-ball is the comparison for the egg of the snail, but even then it will be pearl ball-like egg' and not 'pearl-like ball', but Naccinārkkiniyar calls this 'uvamattokai'.

These words, pearl-ball, peacock, and Gandharva vaḻakkam, as they refer respectively to egg, women and clandestine love can be called 'uvama ākupeyar'. Perhaps Naccinārkkiniyar holds that 'mayil' (peacock) can be extended as 'mayil pōṉṟa makaḷir' (peacock like women) and as the sign of comparison and the thing compared are understood, he calls it 'uvama-t-tokai'. But even granting this, there is no reason why it should be called "ākupeyar on the basis of uvamattokai" as there is no such usage, since ākupeyar is based on a single word and not on a tokai, compound word.

The later grammarians refer to such occurences as 'metaphors'. They can also be called 'uvama ākupeyar'. Also, the meaning of every Tokai except 'aṉmoḻi-t-tokai' is patent within the tokai itself, whereas aṉmoḻi-t-tokai refers to a thing which is not within the tokai itself and so also ākupeyar.[3] Cēṉāvaraiyar brings the uvama ākupeyar under the exceptions mentioned by Tolkāppiyam sūtram.[4] So it can be held that these words-nittilappantu, mayil, Gandharava vaḻakkam mentioned by Naccinārkkiniyar, lie outside the class of ākupeyar, and can be better classified as metaphor' where the signs of comparison and the things compared are understood.

There are some other places where Naccinārkkiniyar has not pointed out the ākupeyar specifically, but refers to similar examples in literature. Some of them are the following:—

"Katir-p-paruti"[5]

"Kaḷ cey kaṭal"[6]

Here also 'Paruti' and 'Kaṭal' are mentioned by Naccinārkkiniyar as ākupeyar and not as "ākupeyar on the basis of uvamattokai".

1. Jīvaka; v. 52.
2. Jīvaka; v. 79.
3. Tol. Cūttiravirutti; p. 44.
4. Tol. Col. Cēṉā; s. 117.
5. Jīvaka; v. 527.
6. *Ibid*; v. 929.

7.2 *A note on tense*

Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar shows his mettle as a great grammarian in the true tradition of reputed commentators, by his subtle analysis of tenses in respect of Tolkappiyam sūtrams.

7.2.1 *Ceyten̲ eccam*

Ceyten̲ eccam is one of the nine types of verbal participles referred to in Tolkāppiyam.[1] According to the grammarians this verbal participle denotes the past tense.[2] Tolkāppiyar says that this can refer to the future tense also.

> "Ceyten̲ eccat-tir̲anta kālam
> Eytiṭan̲ uṭaittē vārākkālam"[3]

Here 'Vārākkālam' is interpreted as referring to both present and future tenses by Iḷampūraṇar and Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar follows him.[4]

Cāttan̲ uṇṭu vantān̲	—	past.
Cāttan̲ uṇṭu varuvīn	—	future.
koṭi āṭi-t-tōn̲r̲um	—	present.

7.2.2 *Ceyten eccam denoting present*

Ceyten̲ eccam denotes past tense. Tolkāppiyar says that it can show future also. Iḷampūraṇar interprets that it can occur in the present too. Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar beariníng these in mind, gives illustrations from literature for such occurences. The beauty of the forest is described by the poet.

> "Taḷiper̲u taṇpulattu-t-talai-p-peyār̲ku arumpīn̲r̲u
> Muḷimutar̲ potuḷiya muṭpur̲a-p-piṭavamum"[5]

Here 'īn̲r̲u' is the verbal participle, belonging to the "ceytu type". Piṭavam (a kind of tree), giving birth to buds,-clustering blossoms. Here the act of giving birth to buds (īn̲r̲u' and clustering (potuḷu)

---

1. Tol. Col. s. 230.
2. Tol. Col. Iḷam; s. 223.
3. Tol. Col. Cēn̲ā; s. 228.
   Tol. Col; s. 230,
   Nan̲n̲ūl. Caṅkara; s. 343
   Tol. Col. s. 241
4. Tol. Col. Iḷam; s. 234.
   Tol. Col; s. 241.
5. Kali; v. 101:1.2.

are simultaneous. So Naccinārkkiniyar interprets that īnru and the present tense here and so he writes 'īnāninru' (āninru-present suffix) for 'īnru'. There are also other places where this participle denotes present tense according to Naccinārkkiniyar.

"Iṇaimalarttārinān itari ēkinān"[1]

"Mannan ētti . . . . . . tolutān"[2]

7.2.3 *Ceyten eccam denoting future*

There is another place where Naccinārkkiniyar has interpreted the participles of ceytu type (with the physical form of past tense) as referring to future in a sequence where the previous one refers to the past, and the succeeding to the future.

"Por pūṇ cumantu poru kōṭṭai aḻittu vempōr
karpā n eḻunta mulaiyār"[3]

Here the breasts adorned with jewels destroying the tusks of elephants, rose, to learn the methods of war. Here 'cumantu', aḻittu, karpān are verbal participles among which 'cumantu' and 'aḻittu' are ceytu type. Naccinārkkiniyar says that 'the breasts were adorned' and so cumantu refers to the past. In the remaining part "aḻittu pōr karpān eḻuntana", 'aḻittu' (destroying) is a thing they are to learn as they study the methods of war and refers to the future. So Naccinārkkiniyar, as he interprets the line, says that "aḻittu is a word in the physical form of past tense but refers to the future".

7.2.4. *Tense of 'Ceya' type of participles*

'Ceya' is another pattern of participles occurring in all the three tenses according to Cēnāvaraiyar.[4] But Naccinārkkiniyar interprets this as occurring in the three tenses with three subtle variations.[5]

1. Maḻai peyya kuḷam niraintatu. past. cause.
2. Kuḷam niraiya maḻai peytatu. future. effect.
3. Ñāyiru paṭa vantān. present, simultaneous occurrence.

---

1. Jīvaka; v. 1621.
2. Ibid; v. 2560.
3. Jīvaka; v. 2340.
4. Tol. Col. Cēnā; s. 228.
5. Tol. Col; s. 230.

21

7.2.5. *Literary evidence for 'ceya type' in present*

Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar brings this application even in his interpretations of literary works, e.g.

"Painnan̲ai avarai pavaḷam kōppavum
Karunan̲ai-k-kāyā kaṇa mayil aviḻavum
Koḻuṅkoṭi mucuṇṭai koṭṭam koḷḷavum
Ceḻuṅkulai kāntaḷ kaiviral pūppavum
Kollai neṭu vaḻi-k-kōpam ūravum
Mullai cān̲r̲a mullai neṭu vaḻi"[1]

Here the Mullai land (forest region) is beautifully portrayed. Kōppavum, aviḻavum, koḷḷavum, pūppavum, ūravum-here all these are simultaneous occurrences, as the heroine bears her husband's separation according to his dictates. So these "ceya type" of participles are referred to as denoting present tense. Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar illustrates that it is like 'ñāyir̲u paṭa vantān̲' (as the sun set he came). The sun setting and his coming are simultaneous occurrences. So also, kōppavum, aviḻavum etc. and the patient waiting of the heroine' are contemporaneous incidents-denoting the present tense.

7.2.6. *Literary evidence for 'ceya type' in future*

Naccin̲ārkkiniyar has shown how "ceya type of participles" refers to the future tense.

"Maḻai .. tuvalai kar̲pa . kūtir nin̲r̲an̲r̲u"[2]

Here 'winter' is beautifully described by the poet. This line means "For the cloud to learn drizzling, the winter stood" '(Tuvalai) kar̲pa', meaning "to learn (drizzling)" is "ceya type of participle". (kūtir) nin̲r̲atu, meaning (winter) stood is the finite verb, succeeding the participle. Here the incident that precedes is the 'winter's standing and that which succeeds is the cloud's learning to drizzle, and this construction is like "Nelviḷaiya maḻai peytatu". Only after it rained there could be a rich harvest of paddy crops and 'viḷaiya, refers to the future tense. So also, the 'cloud learning to drizzle' occurs in the future, after 'the winter having stood'. This is Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar's interpretation. He says 'kar̲pa' the ceya type of participle, refers to the future too and this is in the sense of 'Effect and

1. Cir̲upāṇ; 11. 164-169.
2. Neṭu; 11. 19, 20. 72.

cause' as we saw earlier.[1] He interprets this 'ceya type of participles' as referring to future in other literary works also.[2]

7.2.7. *A subtle point in the tense of "ceya type of participle"*

Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar points out certain things in respect of "ceya type of participle" which reveal his subtle intellect. The heroine refers to the outlook of grace or charity (aruḷ) on the part of the hero, and because of that, the feeling of love she develops. She says:-

"Tān̲, yān̲ nir̲ainta an̲puṭaiyēn̲ āka aruḷākkum"[3]

Tān̲-hero. yān̲-heroine. āka (to become)-ceya type of participle. Aruḷākkum (to have an outlook of charity) refers to the future. Naccin̲ārkkiniyar interprets as:

"Tān̲, yān̲ āka aruḷ ākkum".

"He will show his charity, so that I can develop love". The outlook of charity on the part of the hero and the execution of the same feeling in action pertains to the future as well as the heroine, developing a feeling of love. So. 'āka' refers to the future. One is "that causes" (aruḷākkum) and the other is "that is caused" (āka). Here both occur in the future, but in their simultaneous present. So Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar says that "Tān̲ yān̲ āka aruḷākkum" occurs as present in the future.

7.2.8. *Conclusions*

We can derive certain conclusions from Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar's interpretations of tenses:-

(1) We saw earlier that according to him kōppavum, aviḷavum etc. refer to the present as their occurrences are simultaneous. But they all occurred in the past as is evident from the poem.[4] So we can surmise, following his interpretation earlier with reference to 'āka'[5] that these kōppavum aviḷavum etc. are denoting the present in the past.

(2) Earlier we saw that 'kar̲pa' (in the line Maḷai tuvalai kar̲pa kūtir nin̲r̲an̲r̲u) refers to the future.[6] But the cloud learning to

1. Supra; pp. 211-212:7. 2. 4.
2. Kur̲iñci; 11. 217-230. Jīvaka; v. 2310.
3, Kali; v. 46: 18-21.
4. Supra; p, 212:7. 2. 5,
5. Ibid; pp. 213-214:7. 2 7.
6. Supra; pp. 212-213:7. 2. 6.

drizzle and the winter having stood are incidents of the past. So deriving from Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar's clarification with reference to 'āka', we can say that 'kaṟpa' (as it is denoting future) is future in the past.

(3) We can now fairly understand some of the qualities of the verbal participles in respect of their tenses by our understanding of Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar, in addition to their natural tenses denoted by the tense suffixes.

(a) The tense of the verbal participle understood by the tense of the finite verb, it takes to.

(b) The tense can also be made out by its occurence as such in a common manner.

(4) According to these qualities mentioned above, all the three tenses can be subdivided as under:—

Present tense,

1. Cāttan̲ ñāyiṟu paṭa vantān̲ — Present in the past,
2. Cāttan̲ ñāyiṟu paṭa varukin̲ṟān̲ — Present in the present.
3. Cāttan̲ ñāyiṟu pa ṭa varuvān̲ — Present in the future.

In the first, the setting of the sun is past, in the second, present and in the last, future. But in all the three, the setting of the sun and the arrival of Cāttan̲ are simultaneous. So they refer to the present. So here we find that the present can be the broad classification of the tense-sense, in respect of simultaneous action and all the three can occur under this distinction, The tenses of the verbal participle can be understood by the finite verbs it takes to, so 'present' is the general classification and it can occur in any tense with reference to the finite verbs it takes to.

past tense

1. Maḻai peyya nel viḷaintatu — past in the past.
2. Maḻai peyya nel viḷaikkin̲ṟatu — past in the present,
3. Maḻai peyya nel viḷaiyum — past in the future.

Peytal (raining) occurs in all the three tenses, but with references to the growing of paddy, it (raining) occurs in the past. Thus pas tense can be classified into three subdivisions.

Future tense

1. Nel viḷaiya maḻai peytatu — Future in the past.
2. Nel viḷaiya maḻai peykiṉṟatu— Future in the present.
3. Nel Viḷaiya maḻai peyyum — Future in the future.

Viḷaital (growing paddy) occurs in all the three tenses, but with reference to the raining, it (growing paddy or harvest) occurs in the future. Thus the future tense can come under three subdivisions.

7.3 *A Study of 'UM'*

'UM' is a conjunctional participle. It is made to suggest often various other interpretations, Tolkāppiyar has classified the implications of 'um' in several sūtrams.[1] Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar follows the lead given by Tolkāppiyar and offers many more interpretations than any other commentator has done.

7.3.1 *Ecca ummai* (*um denoting incompletion*)

This is perhaps the most frequent and Tolkāppiyar mentions this as the first among various kinds of 'um'.[2] Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar, wherever Tolkāppiyar uses this 'um', interprets it to offer various other ideas that this 'um' implies, which according to him, Tolkāppiyar has suggested by using this participle. For example:—

Uyirmey (syllabic letter in Tamil which is considered as one unit) when occurring as the final syllable of a word is usually treated as a vowel ending in matters of Sandhi. In the word 'Viḷa' the uyirmey ḷa is divided as ḷ + a, and 'a' is the vowel and so it is considered that the vowel is the final sound in the word. This is all what Tolkāppiyar says. His sūtram is this':

"Uyir meyyīṟum uyir īṟṟu iyaṟṟē"[3]

The 'um' in "uyirmeyyīṟum", as interpreted by Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar, implies the idea that this way of treating it, is applicable even to the uyirmey in the middle of a word. In the word 'Varaku'. 'ra' forms the middle syllable and it is taken as 'r + a'. Even the author, classifying the words ending with kuṟṟiyalukaram (short 'u') on the basis of the sounds, preceding the final syllable, referring to 'varaku'

1. Tol. Col. ss. 257, 285-287, 289, 291-295 etc.
2. Tol. Col; s. 257.
3. Tol. Eḻuttu. s. 106.

instead of calling it 'uyir mey-t-toṭar' calls it 'uyir-t-toṭar', treating the uyirmey 'ra' in the middle of the word as an uyir (vowel) i.e. 'a'.[1]

7.3.2 *Different interpretations for 'um'*

The different interpretations that 'um' can suggest, on the basis of Naccinārkkiniyar's commentary, can be classified as under:—

1. 'um' suggesting different meanings.
2. 'um' taken to stand at a place or places different from where it actually occurs.

7.3.3 *'Um' denoting muṟṟu (completion) and eccam (incompletion)*

The commentator stretches the particle 'um' so as to mean different things also.

"Iru tiṇai-p-piṟinta aimpāṟkiḷavikkum
Uriyavai uriya peyar vayināṉa"[2]

Naccinārkkiniyar interprets this sūtra thus: The statement made with a finite verb with a particular gender applies sometimes to all the five genders. For instance if one says "nañcuṇṭāṉ cām" (he who swallows poison dies), it may also be applicable for other genders also as under.

(a) Nañcuṇṭāṉ cām.	āṇpāl. (masculine).
Nañcuṇṭāḷ cām.	peṇpāl (feminine).
Nañcuṇṭār cāvar.	palarpāl. (epicene plural).
Nañcuṇṭatu cām.	oṉṟaṉpāl. (neuter singular).
Nañcuṇṭaṉa cām.	palaviṉpāl. (neuter plural).

(akṟinai = non human is here denoted as neuter)

The 'um' in the phrase 'aimpāṟkiḷavikkum' has suggested this idea according to Naccinārkkiniyar. Here 'um' implies that the statement applies individually to all the five genders and so he calls this 'um' as muṟṟummai ('um' denoting completion).

But in a few instances this 'um' may suggest that what is referred to in the statement, may be applicable to anyone or more of these five genders. This 'um' is called eccavummai ('um' denoting incompletion). For example:

1. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 406.
2. Tol. Col; s. 163,

(b) Pārppān kaḷ uṇṇān — The Brahmin man will not drink toddy.

Pārppani kaḷ uṇṇāḷ — The Brahmin woman will not drink toddy.

Pārppār kaḷ uṇṇār — The Brahmins will not drink toddy.

Here there is no question of the neuters being considered to be applicable.

7.3.4. *'Um' denoting eccam (incomplete) and iḻivu ciṟappu (meanness)*

'Um' has other meanings as well such as 'iḻivu ciṟappu'. Ordinarily the 'um' occurs with one specific grammatical meaning only. But Naccinārkkiniyar some times interprets one particular 'um' as implying the grammatical meaning of a different 'um'. Sūtram 427 of Tol. Eḻuttu states that certain words including the interrogative beginning with 'yā' when followed by the plosives, get that plosives doubled. For example:

Yāṅku + koṇṭān = yāṅku-k-koṇṭān.

Sūtram 428 states that the interrogative beginning with 'yā' follows the 'no change' rule i.e. the doubling of the plosive will not apply. e.g. yāṅku + koṇṭān = yāṅku koṇṭān. The phrase here is

'Iyalpum ākum'.

This 'um' is eccavummai with retrospective reference, because it implies that the no change rule here mentioned operates optionally with the doubling rule mentioned earlier.

There is also another variety of 'um' which specifies the meanness or greatness of the noun to which it is attached. "Aracarum virumpum" "even the king will like". Here 'um' after the word aracar (king) shows his superiority and the superiority of thing desired. 'Nāyum tiṉṉātu' - Even the dog will not eat". Here the 'um' attached to 'nāy' (dog) implies the inferiority of the dog or rather the thing rejected. This is called "Iḻivu ciṟappu ummai" (the 'um' of meanness).[1]

In 'iyalpum ākum' the 'um' alternatively may be interpreted as iḻivu ciṟappu ummai when the implication will be that this 'no change rule' in this instance does not show any greater validity when compared to the doubling rule mentioned earlier. The greater validity of the doubling is based on its greater frequency than the rule of no change in this case.

1. Tol. Col. s. 257.

7.3 5. *'Um' taken to other place or places'*

Tolkāppiyar prescribes a sandhi rule for the word 'pū' (flower) followed by a plosive.

"Pūveṉ oru peyar āyial piṉṟē
Āvayin vallеḻuttu mikutalum urittē"[1]

The natural sequence of the second line is this:

Valleḻuttu mikutalum urittē.

Here the 'um' is attached to the verbal noun 'mikutal' (doubling of the plosive). The meaning is then that the doubling of the plosive also is valid.

e.g. Pū + koṭi = pūkkoṭi.

What is the force of this 'um'? It may mean in some places that this change rule will also apply; that is this will apply in addition to the no change rule. Taken in that sense, this will lead to an absurdity; for there is no case of the no change rule in this case. If the emphasis is not on 'mikutal' but on 'Valleḻuttu', it will mean that with reference to the change rule, even a plosive will come in i.e. in addition, the same rule, prescribing the coming in of some of the consonants- i.e. in this case the rule of the nasal coming in:

e.g. Pū + koṭi = Pūṅkoṭi.

This may be clearly explained by taking the 'um' to be attached to 'Velleḻuttu' from its present place after 'mikutal'.

7.3.6. *Displacement of 'um'*

Sometimes Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar displaces or dislodges the 'um' and interprets it as occuring in some other place, in a far fetched way to bring out his own views.

"Puḷḷi īṟṟu muṉ uyir taṉittu iyalātu
Meyyoṭum civaṇum avviyal keṭuttē"[2]

Here this obviously means that the vowel, succeeding a word ending with a consonant, gets attached to the consonant.

e.g. Pāl + aritu = Pālaritu.

But Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar interprets this in another way. The 'um' in the sūtram is attached to 'meyyoṭu' as 'meyyoṭum' meaning "along

1. Tol. Eḻuttu s. 268.

2. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 138.

with the consonant". But Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar dislodges the 'um' and makes it attached to 'puḷḷi īṟṟu mun̲' as "Puḷḷi īṟṟu mun̲n̲um". This means "before the consonant ending also". Then he interprets the sūtram like this. This 'um' therefore contemplates some environment other than the consonantal ending viz., the kuṟṟiyalukaram (short 'u') ending. Not only before kuṟṟiyalukaram but before consonant also, the vowel gets merged as :

Nāku + aritu = Nākaritu

According to Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar the 'u' in Nāku is not lost, but retains its identity. This is the point he makes elsewhere also which we have analysed.[1] There are other instances where Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar dislodges 'um' in his own way for emphasising some of his grammatical views.[2]

7.3.7. *'Um' denoting etirmaṟai (negation)*

Negative 'um' — The 'um' sometimes gives the opposite idea of what has been already said and Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar interprets this with great ingenuity. His analysis of this 'um' in negation can be classified thus: (1) Frequency (2) balance.

(1) *Frequency and non frequency (rare)*: Sometimes the 'um' that is used, includes the opposite idea that is more common than the natural idea. There is the sūtra :

Van̲puṟa varūum vin̲ā-v-uṭai vin̲ai-c-col
Etir-maṟu-t-tuṇarttutaṟk-urimai-y-um uṭaittē.[3]

Here it means that the interrogative verb used to denote certainty can denote the negative idea also. Suppose a man, under the effects of drinking, abuses another and he is questioned later (in his sober mood) about that, he might say 'Vaitēn̲ē' i.e. "Did I abuse, did I?" Here this interrogative verb can express two ideas : one negative (I did not) and the other affirmative (I did). But the 'um' in the sūtram (urimaiym), according to Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar, suggests the idea that the negative meaning is more common than the affiirmative. By putting this question 'Vaitēn̲ē' ...... one expresses more often that he did not abuse. The occurrence of affirmative is also (I did abuse) there.

The Urimaiyum (also being valid), 'um' is taken as having a negative significance "not being valid": The negative meaning has

1. Infra; 7.4.4. pp. 227-228.
2. Tol. Eḻuttu ss. 384, 418. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 43, p. 117.
3. Tol. Col. s. 246.

a peculiar significance ; ordinarily when one uses 'um' (even if) in Tamil this means that "the action will not take place but if it were to take place, as a rare event". The commentator states the 'um' has that kind of significance. That is in this case the meaning of negative is much more frequent than the affirmation implied by such word as "vaitēṉē ?". There are many places where Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar investigates this 'um' in negation and explains the 'frequency point' suggested by the 'um'.

(2) *Balance* : We saw earlier that 'um' includes the affirmative and negative ideas and sometimes it emphasises the frequent usage. There are places where the affirmative and negative usages are equal.

"Mullai kuṟiñci marutam neytal eṉa-c
Colliya muṟaiyāl collav-um paṭumē"[1]

Here Tolkāppiyar refers to forest, mountain, agricultural tract, seaboard and says they are also known as mullai, kuṟiñci, marutam and neytal respectively. According to Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar the 'um' in the sūtram (collavum paṭumē) denotes the sense of negation. It means that these four regions can also be listed in a different order. He points out in the anthologies and in the eighteen kīḻkaṇakku works in Tamil that this order is sometimes observed and at other times not observed. So the 'um' refers to the other order of classification also. But which is more common? Tolkāppiyar does not say definitely. Therefore Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar holds that both are equally common. He has equal proficiency in both grammar and literature. He is perhaps the only grammarian who has written commentaries on both grammatical and literary works. His extensive references bear evidence to this. It is clear from his commentary that literature and grammar are complementary to each other in helping our understanding of one by the other.

7.4. *The significance of Māṭṭēṟu or application*

If the author is to apply the rule he has laid down earlier, with reference to something else, he would mention it "like the one said before" – and this is called 'Māṭṭēṟu' (application). In other words 'Māṭṭēṟu' is the emphasis of the similarity of rules for different categories. This method is exploited by the grammarians for the sake of brevity. From Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar's commentary on Tolkāppiyam we find various kinds of māṭṭēṟu.

1. Tol. Poruḷ s. 5.

7.4.1. *Application - Similarity of the rules - limited*

When the rules of one category are applied to another, all the rules may not be applied, for only some of the rules will fit in with the other. The verbal nouns ending in 'ñ', when succeeded by a plosive in alvaḻi and vēṟṟumai, should have that plosive doubled and should have an 'u' before the plosive and after 'ñ'. This is sūtram 296 (Tol. Eḻuttu). The next states that even if this 'ñ' is succeeded by 'ñ', 'n', 'm' and 'v', it would get an addition of 'u' in both kinds of Sandhi i.e. Alvaḻi and Vēṟṟumai.

1.	uriñ + kaṭitu	uriñu-k-kaṭitu	vallinam	Alvaḻi.
	uriñ + kaṭumai	uriñu-k-kaṭumai	,,	Vēṟṟumai.
2.	uriñ + ñāṉṟatu	uriñu ñāṉṟatu	mellinam	Alvaḻi.
	uriñ + ñāṟci	uriñu ñāṟci	,,	Vēṟṟumai.
3.	uriñ + valitu	uriñu valitu	iṭaiyiṉam	Alvaḻi.
	uriñ + valimai	uriñu valimai	,,	Vēṟṟumai.

Tolkāppiyar next in his sūtram 298 says that this rule is applicable when the ending is 'n'. This may appear to mean that 'n' should have all the changes prescribed for 'ñ' both in 'alvaḻi' and 'vēṟṟumai'. But Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar states that this application is valid in a limited way only i.e. the change prescribed for 'ñ' do not occur in both alvaḻi and vēṟṟumai for 'n' and they apply to 'Alvaḻi' only.

1.	Porun + kaṭitu	porunu-k-kaṭitu.	vallinam.	⎫
2.	Porun + ñāṉṟatu	porunu ñāṉṟatu.	melliṉam.	⎬ Al-
3.	Porun + valitu	porunu valitu.	iṭaiyiṉam.	⎭ vaḻi.

So this type of māṭṭēṟu (a part and not the whole of one being applied to another) can be brought under "application limited". This is because the next sūtram prescribes a different rule for vēṟṟumai.[1]

7.4.2. *Application-similarity of the rule-extended*

When a rule applicable to one category is applied to another, sometimes the scope of the application is increased and additions are made. This is evident from Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar's commentary. Tolkāppiyar explains the overlapping of case signs with reference to Mutal (the whole) and Ciṉai (the part). They are two in number.[2]

---

1. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 299.
2. Tol. Col; ss. 88, 89.

(a) If 'atu' is the case sign suffixed to the whole, 'ai' is the case sign suffixed to its part

e.g. "yāṉai atu kōṭṭai-k-kuṟāittāṉ".
(He cut down the tusk of the elephant)

yāṉai "elephant", the whole, takes the 'atu' and kōṭu "tusk", its part, takes the case sign 'ai'.

(b) If 'ai' is the case sign suffixed to the whole (i.e. the elephant) 'kaṇ' is the sign suffixed to its part (i.e. tusk).

e.g. yāṉaiyai-k-kōttiṉkaṇ kuṟaittāṉ.
(He cut the elephant at the tusk)

In the sūtram, there is a word 'teḷḷitu' which the commentator stretches to imply another thing also. He refers to another kind of overlapping of case signs.

(c) 'ai' occurring both in the whole (i.e. elephant) and its 'part' (i.e. tusk).

e.g. yānai yai-k-kōṭṭai-k-kuṟaittāṉ.
(He cut the elephant, the tusk).

Tolkāppiyar says that the rules he has laid down for the whole and part apply to Piṇṭappeyar (non-organic collective nouns) also, thereby making his rules applicable to both the kinds of overlapping mentioned above in the sūtram.[1] But the commentator has already added one more to the two mentioned by Tolkāppiyar. All the three apply to non-organic collective nouns as well and he gives examples for all the three, "ā-iyal" "that nature" is thus extended to cover cases not mentioned specifically by Tol-kāppiyar though this implication is held to be in the mind of Tolkāppiyar.

1. Kuppaiyatu talaiyai-c-citaṟiṉāṉ.
2. Kuppaiyai-t-talaiyiṉ kaṇ citaṟiṉāṉ.
3. Kuppaiyai-t-talaiyai-c-citaṟiṉāṉ.

The commentator extends the scope of application like this in various other places also.[2]

7.4.3. *Application (Regular)*

As the son inherits the father's property the affirmation of the identity of the rule descends direct to another category and this is natural. For example:

1. Tol. Col; s. 91.
2. Tol. Eḻuttu; ss. 318, 319, 324, etc.

"Meyyiṉ iyaṟkai puḷḷi yoṭu nilaiyal".

"Ekara okara-t-tiyaṟkaiyum aṟṟē".[1]

Tolkāppiyar, in his first sūtram here, says that the consonants have dots. In the next one he says that 'e' and 'o' are also similar.[2] It means 'e' and 'o' also have dots and this application is direct and natural. Iḷampūraṇar also interprets like this.[3]

7.4.4. *Application (Irregular)*

Tolkāppiyar says that the consonants have dots and referring to kuṟṟukaram (short 'u') he states that it is also similar.[4] It means kuṟṟukaram also has a dot. The reference to consonants is in the second sūtram of 'Puṇariyal', and the reference to kuṟṟukaram is in the third sūtram. So it will be natural if it is interpreted to mean that the rule for consonants in the second sūtram (having dot) alone is applied to kuṟṟukaram (in the third sūtram). This is the natural and direct way of interpreting the assertion of similarity. But Naccinārkkiṉiyar goes further. According to him what is said in the 36th sūtram applies to the 3rd sūtram of Puṇariyal. This is application in anticipation. The 36th sūtram says that in Sandhi, if a vowel succeeds a consonant, it will become one with the consonant. Naccinārkkiṉiyar states that kuṟṟukaram (short 'u') also, like the consonant, will allow the vowel to become one with it. This is his interpretation for the 3rd sūtram. The examples are:

Maram + aritu = Maramaritu. m + a = ma.
Nāku + aritu = Nākaritu. ku + a = ka.

Here in the second example we should not hold according to him that the 'u' vanishes and the succeeding vowel has become one with the remaining consonant. The other commentators hold that two vowels cannot become one as do a consonant and a vowel (in a syllable).[5] But here according to Naccinārkkiṉiyar, in 'Nākaritu' the short 'u' as well as the vowel 'a' that succeeds it exist together. We have to point out that he does not contemplate, like Iḷampūraṇar, the dot on the kuṟṟiyalukaram. Though this assertion of similarity of a thing with reference to something that succeeds much later, is unnatural, yet Naccinārkkiṉiyar attempts to prove a point.

1. Tol. Eḻuttu; ss. 15, 16.
2. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 16.
3. Tol Eḻuttu; Iḷam; ss. 15, 16.
4. Tol. Eḻuttu; ss. 104, 105.
5. Tol. Cūttira virutti; p. 40.

The commentator differentiates between the consonant + vowel and kuṟṟiyalukaram + vowel. But in Tamil there is no contrast possible like Nāku + aritu versus nāk + aritu. All these attempts are for filling up a lacuna in Tolkāppiyam which does not lay down any rule for the disappearance of kuṟṟiyalukaram when followed by a vowel. Iḷampūraṇar has stated that the consonant not only stands at the end but also gives room for a vowel following to become one syllable along with it. Then he explains the sūtram stating that kuṟṟiyalukaram is similar; by stating that similarity applies only to kuṟṟiyalukaram being one with the succeeding vowel. He does not contemplate the dot over the kuṟṟiyalukaram. In this way he provides for the loss of kuṟṟiyalukaram.[1] But the question is why this is not mentioned in uyirmayaṅkiyal. If this is a rule of no change and if the kuṟṟiyalukaram is still there this need not be stated in uyirmayaṅkiyal. That is why probably Naccinārkkiniyar states that the kuṟṟiyalukaram is still there when a vowel follows.

7.4.5. *Application - proximate*

The separation from the heroine as laid down in Akattiṇai may be due (1) to defend the country or (2) to earn wealth, according to Tolkāppiyar.[2] He enunciates by the next sūtra that this is applicable to all the four castes. It is clear that when Tolkāppiyar says this is applicable, he means that the meaning of the preceding sūtram is applicable. But there are two ideas expressed in the first sūtram.

1. Separation of the hero from the heroine to defend the country.
2. Separation to earn wealth.

Here Naccinārkkiniyar interprets that the sūtram is applicable to the second idea formulated by Tolkāppiyam i.e. the earning of wealth is intended for the merchant community and this is applicable to all the four castes. The second idea in the preceding sūtram lies proximate to the succeeding sūtram. Hence this is his reason for limiting the application to the last one alone being bound as the commentator by the caste rules of his age.

7.5. *The order of placing*

The author normally emphasises the importance of things through epithets, figures of speech etc. but, sometimes his order of

1. Tol. Eḻuttu s. 105.
2. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 28.

placing things also reveals a special significance. The grammarians consider this as one of the ten good qualities of a literary work viz., Muṟaiyiṉ vaippu.[1] The topics should not be heaped up. There must be an order. If a thing which must be said at one place is said elsewhere it is considered as a literary shortcoming known as "mayaṅkakkūṟal".[2] Tolkāppiyar's list of uttis contains Tokuttuk-kūṟal, vakuttu meynniṟuttal, Tokutta moḻiyāṉ vakuttaṉar kōṭal etc. which also explain the basis in some cases of arranging the topics.[3]

7.5.1. *The various kinds of order*

It is an interesting study to investigate the various kinds of order in the arrangement of things, from the commentary of Nacciṉārk-kiṉiyar. There may be (1) an order in the arrangement or (2) no order in the arrangement of topics or things. These two can be further subdivided according to their importance.

1. Arrangement of similar things together.
2. Arrangement of similar things at different places.
3. Occurrence of a similar thing between the sequence.
4. Occurrence of a different thing between the sequence.
5. Arrangement of a thing in the end of a category and at the beginning of another category.

(1) *Arrangement of similar things together*

The author classifies all similar and consistent ideas in one place. Karam, kāram and kāṉ are Eḻuttu-c-cāriyai (term used in designating a letter of the alphabet) according to Tolkāppiyar. He has mentioned kāram and karam together for which Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar gives three reasons.[4]

1. Rhythmic reason i.e. they sound well when said together.
2. Their greater frequency.
3. Their occurrence both in Sanskrit and Tamil.

Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar further analyses the reasons for the occurrence of sūtrams one after another at many places.[5]

---

1. Naṉṉūl; s. 13.
2. Tol. Poruḷ. Pērā; s. 663.
3. Tol. Poruḷ. Pērā; s. 665.
4. Tol. Eḻuttu. s. 134.
5. Tol. Col. ss. 450-451, 456-457, pp. 445, 455.

(2) *Arrangement of similar things at different places*

Here two similar things which could be said at one place are said at different places. Naccinārkkiniyar investigates how this may not be creating a disorder and why they are said at different places. Tolkāppiyar says that there are eight things that precede an action-the act, doer, object of a verb, place of action, time of action., instrument therefor, the recepient of the benefit of the act, and the purpose of that act.[1] As this sūtram gives the concomitant precedents to a verb, this sūtram should have been said in 'vinaiyiyal', which deals with verbs. But this is said in "vērrumai mayaṅkiyal" dealing with cases. Therefore this apparent disorder should be explained. Naccinārkkiniyar analyses the reason therefor.

"The potter made one pot". Here "made" (vanaintān) is the verb which has all the eight above mentioned and Naccinārkkiniyar proves that all these eight are the origin of the cases. In this verb-

1. The doer (potter) is denoted by the first case.
2. The object of the verb (pot) and the root-action of the verb are denoted by the second case.
3. The instruments for making the pot are denoted by the third case.
4. The recipient and the purpose of the action are denoted by the fourth case.
5. The place and time of the action are denoted by the seventh case.
6. As the potter gives, one receives the pot and so the pot leaves the potter-this act of leaving involves 5th case.

So, as it involves, in fact only, the vērrumai or the cases, Naccinārkkiniyar states that this sūtram, though it deals with the things preceding the verb, is placed in vērrumai mayaṅkiyal which deals with the overlapping of the cases. There are many other places where Naccinārkkiniyar investigates and explains the order of placing which may come under this category.[2]

(3) *Occurrence of a similar thing between the sequence*

The grammarian calls this kind of order 'Ciṅka nōkku' (Lion's survey).[3] A lion looks ahead and backwards and determines its

1. Tol. Col. s. 113.
2. Tol. Col; ss. 83, 119, 173, 212, 214, 215, 274, 282, 288, 462.
   Tol. Poruḷ; ss. 90:10, p. 315.. 90;11, p. 316., 193, p· 685.. 194, p. 686
3. Tol. Eḻuttu; p. 13. Nannūl; s. 19.

course of action. So also a sūtram should incorporate the preceding and succeeding ideas to avoid contradiction. Naccinārkkiniyar exploits this method to interpret some of the sūtrams. Tolkāppiyar lays it down that the heroine should conduct herself in such a way that her premarital love does not become public before-time. The qualities needed for this are self-control, mentality that can preserve a secret, absence of perversion etc.[1] If she were to reveal the affair earlier it becomes a fault and hence related to the preceding and succeeding sūtrams where such things are described. So Naccinārkkiniyar calls this Ciṅkanōkku (lion gaze).

(4) *Occurrence of a different thing between the sequence*

If the author speaks of a different idea in a sequence, it becomes the duty of a commentator to connect them and justify the order of such placement. It is compared to the flying eagle suddenly coming down to carry away the chickens and so this order of placing is called 'Paruntin vīḻvu' (eagle landing).[2] Tolkāppiyar defines the 'Finite verb' by two sūtrams (427, 429) in Collatikāram. But there is an interlying sūtram (428) describing the peyareccam and vinaieccam that denote three tenses and are used accordingly. Here it is evident that the author has mentioned the "eccam" in between his comments on finite verbs.[3] Naccinārkkiniyar investigates the matter and classifies this intrusion under the category of 'Paruntin vīḻvu'. The purpose is to incorporate the relevant definition of finite verb in to 'eccam' as well. There are many other instances in Naccinārkkiniyar's commentary, which come under this category.[4]

(5) *Arrangement of a thing at the end of a category or at the beginning of the next category*

When there are certain categories or rules which may be classified equally with one set or the other set, the author sometimes places them at the end of the first set or at the beginning of the other set, suggesting thereby that there is an overlapping where a few may be taken either with what precedes or with what follows. This is separate from the third (7.5.3.), where the rules are grouped as separate from the former and the latter though placed between those two. The clandestine affair between the hero and the heroine becomes explicit (Veḷippaṭai). Does this exposure of the premarital love

1. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 209.
2. Tol. Eḻuttu; p. 13, Nannūl; s. 19.
3. Tol. Col. ss. 427, 429.
4. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 83, Tol. Col; s. 87.
Tol. Poruḷ; ss. 9, 25.

come under kaḷavu or kaṟpu? Tolkāppiyar says it is similar to 'kāṟpu.'[1] The very fact that it is described as similar to kaṟpu shows that it is not kaṟpu pure and simple. But in ceyyuḷiyal he says it is kaṟpu.[2] This is the reason why Tolkāppiyar has placed this sūtram, referring to the exposure of the premarital love, at the end of the chapter on kaḷavu. So Naccinārkkiniyar holds this placement of this sūtram between kaḷavu and kaṟpu i.e. to show that it may overlap both with kaḷavu which precedes and kaṟpu which follows. There are many other instances under this category.[3]

7.5.2. *The reasons for the order of placing*

Naccinārkkiniyar gives various reasons for the order of placing and they can be classified under five heads.

1. Importance.
2. Affinity.
3. Summing up and elaboration.
4. Frequency and non-frequency.
5. Order of cause and effect.

(1) *Importance*

Pavaṇanti, the author of Naṉṉūl, says that importance and affinity are good reasons for establishing an order.[4] From the study of Naccinārkkiniyar this basis of importance can be grouped under three headings. They are:

(a) Importance of what is stated first.

(b) Importance of what is stated at the end.

(c) Importance of what is stated in the middle.

(a) *Importance of what is stated first*

It is usual that when things are classified they are listed according to their order of importance. Tolkāppiyar refers to the three forces viz., infantry, elephant force and cavalry[5]-and Naccinārkkiniyar holds they are mentioned in the order of their decreasing

1. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 141.
2. Tol. Poruḷ. Pērā; s. 141.
3. Tol. Eḻuttu; ss. 31, 194, 243, 262, Tol. Col; ss. 205, 391, Tol. Poruḷ; ss. 79: 16-18., 102:7., 141., 79: 3-4.
4. Naṉṉūl; s. 78.
5. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 72:1-2.

importance. The soldiers (infantry) stand ready to fight and reach Heaven and hence they are mentioned first. The elephants, with their instinct to kill when enraged, follow them-the horses unless driven cannot feel enraged of their own accord. Therefore they are mentioned last. There are many other places which can be brought under this order or placing, according to Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar.[1]

(b) *The importance of what is stated at the end*

Some times the author arranges the things mentioned in the order of their increasing importance. The thing that is said finally will be the most important in this grouping. Tolkāppiyar classifies Akattiṇai, as

1. Mutal: the basic things viz., place and time.
2. Karu: the product of particular place.
3. Uri: the real theme of poetry viz., the aspect of love peculiar to each place.'[2]

Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar investigates this order of placing with his usual references to literature. Most of the poems in Akam words, though constituted of mutal, and karu, gain importance and significance through 'uri'. Also there are poems without mutal, but karu and uri only and poems without mutal and karu, but uri only. In mutal and karu, karu is of greater importance and as between karu and uri, uri is of greater importance. The three main categories of Tumpai-t-tiṇai also come under this type of order according to Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar.[3]

(c) *The importance of what is stated in the middle*

Sometimes the middle is more important than the preceding and the succeeding, being as it were the central light illuminating the rest. Tolkāppiyar enunciates how the maid comes to know of the premarital love affair between the hero and the heroine.

1. Kur̲aiyur̲a uṇartal.
2. Mun̲n̲ur̲a uṇartal.
3. Iruvarum uḷvaḻi avan̲ vara uṇartal.[4]

---

1. Tol Eḻuttu; ss. 7, 210., Tol. Col; ss. 13, 66, 113. Tol. Poruḷ; ss. 1, p. 6, 14, p. 48., 100:1, p. 350., 130, p. 527., 248, p. 759., 60:6; p. 165
2. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 3.
3. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 71.
4. Ibid; s. 127.

Firstly the lady companion comes to know of this love affair through the hero's request to her to convey to the heroine his passion for the latter and to arrange a meeting. Secondly she comes to know through undertaking the suggestions and indications, and thirdly by his arrival when the heroine and her companion are together. Here among the three, the second one, i.e. the suggestions and indications are very important as they play an important part in the other two, and as without this the interpretation of the other may not be correct. Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar says this is the reason why it is stated in the middle and it is an example for the importance of what occurs in the middle (like Aṟam, poruḷ and In̲pam, where poruḷ is more important than Aṟam and In̲pam).[1]

(2) *Affinity*

Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar investigates the order of the vowels a, ā, i, ī, u, ū, etc. First the short vowels, — every short vowel succeeded by its long vowel in the order of affinity.[2] The affinity here is that they have the same place of origin, effort, quantity, meaning and form.[3] Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar, bearing in mind all these points of affinity in birth, quantity and meaning. 'e' and 'o' succeed a, i, u satisfying the same reasons, and also 'ai' after them to be followed by 'o' 'ō' and 'au'. Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar employs the same arguments for the order of placing of the consonants also.[4]

(3) *Tokai and viri* (*Summing up and elaboration*)

This is another kind of arrangement i,e. mentioning in a summary way, classifying it further and elaborating it later on.

According to Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar this is one of the bases for the arrangement of the rules. Grammarians employ these methods for the proper arrangement of rules and they call them Tokai, Vakai and Viri.[5] There is a chapter called 'Tokai marapu' in Tolkāppiyam. Here, what had been later discussed at length by individual sūtras are summed up.[6] This is followed by 'urupiyal'. Tokai Marapu thus sums up the Sandhi rules whilst urupiyal extensively discusses at length all that have been summed up in Tokaimarapu. So Urupiyal

---

1. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 92, p. 340.
2. Tol Eḻuttu; s. 1, p. 30.
3. Nan̲n̲ūl; s. 72.
4. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 1, pp. 31-32.
5. Nan̲n̲ūl. Ciṟappuppāyiram.
6. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 143.

succeeds Tokai marapu.[1] Uyir mayaṅkiyal etc. follow urupiyal, which go to form 'Sandhi' in an extensive manner.[2]

(4) *Frequency and non-frequency*

Words used in verses are of four kinds according to Tolkāppiyar.[3]

1. Iyaṟcol. 3. Ticai-c-col.
2. Tiricol. 4. Vaṭacol.

Iyaṟcol and Tiricol belong to Tamil language. Ticai-c-col, dialectic words, and Vaṭacol, Northern or Sanskrit words, are words that have come to stay in Tamil from different regions. Naccinārkkiniyar says, as their occurrence is not frequent, they are mentioned after Iyaṟcol and Tiri col. Iyaṟcol and Tiricol are mentioned first according to their importance in Tamil and their frequent occurence. The reason he gives therefore, is frequency and non-frequency. The order of consonants as vallinam, mellinam and iṭaiyinam is also investigated by the commentators. Their reason is that, among vallinam, four occur at the initial of words whilst only three amongst the mellinam and two amongst the iṭaiyinam.[4]

There is another method by which Tolkāppiyar emphasises, according to Naccinārkkiniyar, the importance of the middle one. He places the most frequent in the middle whilst the less frequent precede and follow it.

kaikkiḷai — (minority)
Aintiṇai — (majority)
Peruntiṇai — (minority).[5]

In Akam works, the main treatment is given only for Aintiṇai and very few poems deal with kaikkiḷai and peruntiṇai.

(5) *Cause and effect*

One thing or one rule leads to another, that is one may discover the pattern of 'Cause and Effect'. Tolkāppiyar classifies the words as Peyar, Vinai, Iṭai and Uri.[6] Vinai (verb) is the activity of the Peyar (noun). So 'Peyar' is placed first followed by 'Vinai'. Rather

1. Tol. Eḻuttu s. 173.
2. Ibid; s. 203.
3. Tol. Col; s. 397.
4. Tol. Eḻuttu; ss. 19-21.
5. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 54, p. 143.
6. Tol. Col; s. 160.

'Vin̲ai' is the effect or activity of the 'noun'. Even in Akattiṇai, the aspects of love prescribed for 'Aintiṇai' are Puṇartal, Pirital, Iruttal Iraṅkal, and ūṭal. The course of sex life follow these five phases or stages — and it is cyclic — Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar explains this arrangement as being based on their being Cause and effect.[1]

There is 'Effect and Cause' classification also as analysed by Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar. This is the reverse of the other. Tolkāppiyar classifies the three permanent values as In̲pam, Poruḷ. Ar̲am, though they are popularly known as Ar̲am, Poruḷ and In̲pam.[2] Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar justifies Tolkāppiyar in asmuch as the 'Poruḷ' must be earned by Ar̲am and effect of Poruḷ is In̲pam. Ar̲am, Poruḷ, In̲pam is an arrangement according to the order of 'Cause and effect' whilst In̲pam, Poruḷ, Ar̲am is an arrangement of the order of 'effect and cause'. We can understand this from Iḷampūraṇar also.[3] If the cause is emphasised in the particular situation the 'cause and effect order' is followed, whilst when the effect is emphasised the effect and cause order is followed. According to Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar, since In̲pam the effect is emphasised in akattiṇai, the 'effect and cause order' is followed.

7.5.3. *Seemingly Irrelevant order*

The author sometimes introduces in an otherwise orderly sequence i.e. a thing or rule which on the face of it appears irrelevant. But the commentator finds justification for this arrangement. The reasons for following an order different from the ordinary one can be classified thus:

1. Chapter or context affinity.
2. Māṭṭēru (Application).
3. A statement at one place that satisfies more than one place (to avoid repetition).
4. Greater frequency.
5. Suggestion beyond specification.

(1) *Chapter affinity*

Tolkāppiyar deals with the Pōli eḷuttu or the free variation or the seemingly similar pronounciation of sounds in sūtrams 54-58 (Tol. Eḷuttu). According to him a + i or a + y will pronounce 'ai' and

1. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 14. p. 48.
2. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 92, p. 340.
3. Tol. Poruḷ;, Iḷam; s. 89, p. 160.

a + u or a + v will pronounce 'au'. He then in the next sūtram prescribes the reduction of the prescribed quantity or mātras for 'ai' and 'au'. But the reduction of time unit for 'ai' and 'au' occurs only in poetry and so it may be argued that this should have been stated in the chapter dealing with verses i.e. Ceyyuḷiyal. The first sūtram deals with the Pōli eḻuttu of ai and au and the next sūtram deals with the same letters i.e. ai, au-with reference to the reduction of their prescribed mātras. So both the sūtram deal with the same letters. Naccinārkkiniyar therefore states that the reduction in their mātras is relevant as occurring in the same context or Atikāra. There are many other places where Naccinārkkiniyar emphasises this order of Chapter (context) affinity.

(2) *Māṭṭēṟu or Application*

According to Naccinārkkiniyar, māṭṭēṟu is also one of the reasons for disturbing the ordinary order. The 15th sūtram in Eḻuttatikāram refers to the dotting of the consonants and the 16th refers to the dotting of 'e' and 'o'. So the discussion of vowels i.e. 'e' and 'o' in between the discussion of consonants may seem out of place. The sūtram about consonants states that they have dots. The next sūtram states only that 'e' and 'o' are similar, without repeating that they will have dots. This way of stating the rule for 'e' and 'o' in a summary way by using the word derived from the demonstrative (aṟṟu) basis would not be available if this statement were stated elsewhere.[1]

(3) *Statement in one Place*

A thing that needs discussion at two places is stated only once and in one chapter for the purpose of avoiding repetition and the reader has to take it to the other relevant place. This is called "orutalai moḻital".[2] 'a', 'i', 'u' are demonstratives. They consist of single letters and as such need mentioning in Eḻuttatikāram. But they are also demonstratives, and have meanings and as such they are words. So they have to be referred to in Collatikāram. Thus they have to be treated as 'letters' as well as 'words'. To avoid repetition, Tolkāppiyar has analysed them only in Eḻuttatikāram according to Naccinārkkiniyar.[3]

(4) *Frequency and non-frequency*

Among the eighteen consonants, only eleven can occur as word final. Tolkāppiyar mentions them as :

1. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 16.
2. Tol. Poruḷ. Pērā; s. 665:9, p. 739.
3. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 31.

ñ, ṇ, n, m, ṉ, y, r, l, v, ḻ, ḷ,[1]

Here according to the alphabetical order, 'ṉ' should occur at the end. But here it is mentioned in the middle. Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar says this is placed in the middle because of the greater frequency of its occurrence as word final than y, r, l, v, ḻ, ḷ. In another place, it is stated that the words beginning with a consonant or vowel occurring after the words do not undergo any change. The usual order is to mention the vowel first and consonant next.[2] Here the 'consonant' precedes the vowel in the sūtram. Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar says this is because the "No change rule" in Sandhi occurs more often with reference to consonants than with reference to vowels.

(5) *Other suggestions*

The author may specify things in an inconsistent order. According to the commentator, this inconsistency is to suggest a thing beyond specification, and Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar exploits this method in his interpretations of Tolkāppiyam. For example: y and ñ occur one for the other i.e. are similar as initials of a verb when following a word ending in ṇ or ṉ.[3]

Maṇ yātta	Maṇ ñātta
Poṉ yātta	Poṉ ñātta.

Here yātta and ñātta have the same meaning. The usual order is that n precedes y as in the alphabet. According to Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar the original is y and not ñ which latter occurs as a variant of y in that particular environment.

Maṇ ñāṉṟa — will not vary as Maṇ yāṉṟa.

Poṉ ñāṉṟa — will not vary as Poṉ yāṉṟa.

Only maṇ yātta and poṉ yātta will vary as maṇ ñātta and poṉ ñātta respectively. There are other places in Eḻuttatikāram where Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar has applied this principle in interpreting the other sūtrams.[4]

1. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 78.
2. Ibid; s. 144.
3. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 146.
4. Tol. Eḻuttu; ss. 103, 114, 123, 131, 133, 145, 146, 147, 160, 164, 168, 191 194, 206, 209, 210, 226, 230, 239, 240, 286, 309, 333, 372, 317, 433, 445.

Tol. Poruḷ; s. 246, p. 756.

PART III

NACCINĀRKKINIYAR AS A LINGUIST

CHAPTER - 8

PHONOLOGY

8.1. *A few ancient conceptions*

8.1.1. *Vaḷiyum icaiyum (Breath and sound)*

That the speech sounds are the effects of air impinging finally on the organs of articulation is the opinion of Tolkāppiyar as claimed by Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar.[1] Breath in a sense is life and hence the ancient Tamil works used the word 'uyir' (life) to mean air, as well as sound.[2] Tolkāppiyar refers to the speech-sounds as the air coming out of the chest that go to make the various sounds.[3]

Akattu vaḷi — The air coming out of the chest.

Eḻu Icai — that which makes the articulated speech sounds.

The 'air' becomes meaningful and significant only when it undergoes the metamorphosis of sound and then later, distinct sounds, and it is evident that all the sounds of a language have their origin in the 'air'-we breathe. The sound sense stage is preceded by a stage of mere 'air'.[4]

8.1.2. *Place of origin of sounds*

The speech sounds can be divided into four categories according to the Tamil grammarians.

1. Uyirkkaṇam — life i.e. the vowels.
2. Van̲kaṇam — the hard group i.e. the stops.
3. Men̲ kaṇam — the soft group i.e. the nasals.
4. Iṭai-k-kaṇam — the medial group i.e. the semi vowels and laterals etc.

---

1. Tol. Eḻuttu, Cir̲appuppāyiram; p. 9.
2. Kur̲iñci; 1. 100, Pur̲am; v. 138, Aiṅ; v. 377, Akam; v. 111, Malai; 11. 6, 35-37.
3. Tol. Eḻuttu. Iḷam; s. 102.
4. Ibid; ss. 83, 102.

According to Tolkāppiyar the vowels have their origin in the larynx, the 'meṉkaṇam' in addition in the nasal.[1] Tolkāppiyar has not referred to the origin of the other two categories. But his commentators Iḷampūraṇar and Naccināṟkkiṉiyar are at pains to interpret Tolkāppiyam as referring to the origin of the other two categories also.[2]

Sounds	*Origin*
Vaṉkaṇam	head (Iḷam and Nac.)
Meṉkaṇam	nose (Tol.)
Iṭaikkaṇam	throat (Iḷam and Nac.)
Uyirkkaṇam	throat (Tol.)

Naccinārkkiṉiyar says that 'āytam' has its origin in the chest and he has also referred to the opinion of some other scholars that 'āytam' has its origin in the head or in the larynx.[3] The author of Naṉṉūl says that 'āytam' has its origin in the head and that valliṉam (plosives) in the chest.[4]

8.1.3. *The form of sounds*

The things that are visible to our eyes have material forms (vaṭivam) and those that are not visible physically but exist conceptually are called 'uru'. Naccināṟkkiṉiyar says that a letter is a sound, characteristic of air, and this sound has a conceptual shape. This has all the qualities of a material form though not visible and therefore considered by using conceptually. His reasons are:[5]

(1) Ceṟippacceṟal: When we blow through a flute all the sounds get concentrated inside.

(2) Ceṟippavarutal: When we blow through a vessel with a small mouth, they reappear again after agitating inside.

(3) Iṭaiyeṟiyappaṭutal: When we make sounds in the open space they get scattered like water waves to reassemble again.

(4) Iṉpa tuṉpam ākkal: The hard sounds denote pain and the soft sounds pleasure.

(5) Uruvum uruvum kūṭip-piṟattal: The conceptual amalgamation of vowel sounds and consonantal sounds to form a syllable.

---

1. Tol. Eḻuttu; ss. 84, 100.
2. Ibid; s. 100.
3. Ibid; s. 101.
4. Naṉṉūl; ss. 75, 87.
5. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 1, p. 32.

(6) Piṟappum ūṟum uṭaimai: The air originating from the navel and other such parts of the body go to make the sounds, perceptible to the ears only. So things that have their origin in the substantial forms must have a shape, though not physical, but conceptual.

(7) Vicumpiṟ piṟantiyaṅkal: The sound like the air has its origin and movement in space (Vicumpu).

(8) The sounds have hard, soft and medium forms. Modern Science supports this statement about the subtle forms because the sounds are differentiated by their wave lengths.

8.1.4. *The importance of the 'A' sound*

Naccinārkkiniyar says that the 'a' is the basis of all sounds. The consonants cannot exist on their own. They can exist only with the sound 'a'. It is difficult to say k, c, ṭ. So they exist only with the sound 'a' as ka, ca, ṭa, etc. Naccinārkkiniyar says that sound 'a' exists in the other eleven vowels also. As one opens the mouth, the sound that is produced naturally is 'a' and all the sounds can be pronounced only when we open the mouth. So all the sounds are in a way the derivatives or developments of the basic sound 'a'. This is Naccinārkkiniyar's contention.[1] It is important to note that the basic 'a' is equated with the 'nāda,' the basis for all sabdas, the rudimentary form of all the sounds. Unless this 'nāda' is active, no sound will be produced. Therefore even when there are other vowel sounds behind them all contain this nāda 'a'.

When we open the mouth the natural sound that is produced is 'a'. The edge of the tongue as it comes close to the palate, and teeth, after the opening of the mouth, produces the letters i. ī, e, ē and ai. As we open the mouth by a slight adjustment of the lip movements (rounding) we pronounce the letters u, ū, o, ō, au.[2] So it is evident, for any sound, it is essential we have to open the mouth. This goes to show that all the other vowels are only the extensions and developments of the sound 'a'.

The sound 'a', though the basis of all other vowel sounds as pronounced with the rest of them, exists in their respective forms. Naccinārkkiniyar quotes in this connection Tirukkuṟaḷ and Gīta. Tiruvaḷḷuvar says that the sound 'a' preceding all other sounds, stands as a basis for the rest of them, and in Gita, Lord Krishna

1. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 46.
2. Tol. Eḻuttu; ss. 85-87.

says that He is the sound 'a' amongst the letters of the alphabet which also means the same thing as above.[1]

8.1.5. *The sound system of syllabic sounds (uyirmey)*

The twelve vowels and the eighteen consonants combine to make up two hundred and sixteen syllabic sounds (12x18). These could be viewed from two different points of view (1) as one integral whole where both consonant and the vowel together get only one mātrai or two mātrais viz, the mātrai of the vowel. This is the part of the syllable, (2) as an aggregate of the two i.e. the consonant and vowel from the point of view of the alphabet.

Naccinārkkiniyar is not able to explain why the quantity (mātrai) of the syllable consisting of a consonant and a vowel does not become $1+\frac{1}{2}=1\frac{1}{2}$, but just one. But he gives an illustration. One measure of water plus half measure of salt (if it could be completely dissolved therein) do not make one and half measures of water, but make only one measure.[2] In another place he gives two illustrations. One, the mixture of salt and water, when the addition of salt does not increase the quantity of water, which means, the syllable retains the quantity (mātrai) of the vowel only is from the integral point of view and the other like the two fingers that stand to make two-which means, the sound of the vowel and the sound of the consonant are separate and distinctive from the alphabetic or the additive point of view. Even as the water to which salt is added gets the quality of the salt and becomes saltish, so also, the vowel gets the characteristics of the consonants as hard, soft and medium sounds. The vowels as such do not have these qualities but the vowels in the syllabic sound because of their association with the consonants acquire these consonantal qualities.[3]

k + a	ka	vaṉkaṇam
ñ + a	ña	meṉkaṇam
y + a	ya	iṭaikkaṇam

8.2. *Intonation*

8.2.1. *Phonemes and allophones in Tamil*

The linguists classify the speech sounds as phonemes which are basic and a change of phoneme will change the meaning of the word

1. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 46.
2. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 10.
3. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 18.

in which they occur. The concrete speech sounds may be allophones of these phonemes. Naccinārkkiniyar in his commentary on sūtram 88 (Tol. Eḻuttu) seems to contemplate such allophones. Tolkāppiyar in his first sūtram says that starting from the sound 'a' and ending with 'ṉ' there are thirty and these are called 'Eḻuttu'. These thirty are the phonemes in Tamil. These eḻuttu with their natural sounds convey sense to the hearer.[1] These are segmental phonemes which occur in linear succession. But along with this there are the supra-segmental phonemes or prosodies.

8.2.2 *Several kinds of intonation*

Every sentence has an intonation pattern in Tamil as in other languages. It is very doubtful whether there is any stress in modern Tamil except in certain dialects like that of Jaffna. It is very difficult to say whether there was any stress in the Tamil of Tolkāppiyam or in the Tamil of the age of Naccinārkkiniyar. The words Naccinārkkiniyar uses are 'eṭuttal' (rising) and 'paṭuttal' (falling). These seem to correspond to the udātta, anudātta of the Sanskrit where they denote only pitch. Naccinārkkiniyar speaks of 'nalital' (neither rising nor falling i.e. medial), 'vilaṅkal' (as in the diphthong where the rising is followed by falling pitch). He also speaks of 'urappal' and 'kāṉaittal'.

8.2.3. *Contrast-due to eṭuttal and paṭuttal ōcai*

It is not clear in what sense Naccinārkkiniyar used these terms. Naccinārkkiniyar elsewhere uses only the 'eṭuttal' and 'paṭuttal'. Though under sūtra 88 (Tol. Eḻuttu) he speaks of these with reference to individual sounds, later he applies these terms to words which have the same phonemes but contrasting in meaning, which contrast he explains as being due to 'eṭuttal' or 'paṭuttal'.[2] It looks as though these references are due to intonation patterns. Though in the absence of further evidence one cannot arrive at their exact phonetic significance, the terms used by Naccinārkkiniyar are used in this essay.

8.2.4 *Imperative verbs and verbal nouns differentiated by 'ōcai'*

The words naṭa, vā, cey, etc. are roots. They are roots from which are formed vinai muṟṟu (finite verbs), viṉai eccam (verbal participle) peyareccam (relative participle), toḻiṟ peyar (verbal nouns) viṉayālaṇaiyum peyar (participial nouns). The ancient Tamil Grammarians argued at length how the same roots could be the bases

1. T.P.M. Maṇiviḷāmālar; p. 364.

2. Infra; 8.2.4., 8.2.5., 8.2.6. etc.

for different kinds of verbs and nouns especially the imperatives and the verbal nouns. Cēṉāvaraiyar thinks the words uṇ (eat), tiṉ (chew), col (tell), kol (kill) the roots, are bases for verbs as well as nouns. Sanskrit scholars would refer to these as "Dātu".[1] Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar feels that words 'naṭa', vā, cey, etc. pronounced as eṭuttal (rising) ōcai denote the verb i.e. the imperative and when pronounced as paṭuttal (falling) ōcai denote the noun. He contemplates the difference between the root forms occuring in fully formed words and the imperative verbs which also have the same forms. Can we identify the root and the imperative mood which have the same phonemes? Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar states they contrast and that in one case, the imperative is pronounced as eṭuttal (perhaps 1-3) while the root in the noun sense is pronounced as paṭuattal (perhaps. 1-1).[2]

The word 'alar' means both 'blossom', an imperative and a 'flower', a noun. Both are differentiated probably ^{1}alar^2 and ^{2}alar^1 respectively. As made clear by Civañāṉa cuvāmikaḷ, the root occurs in the fully formed words. For instance in 'alarntaṉa', the root according to the convention of the grammarians is a verbal noun, the finite verbal meaning that they (the buds) did the blossoming. Therefore here also the root 'alar' is a noun and therefore, according to Civañāna cuvāmikal, it is pronounced with paṭuttal ōcai ^{2}alar^1 (ntaṉa).[3]

It is difficult to say when such words occur in poetry whether they nouns or verbs, since they are the same in orthography, but commentators like Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar explain and differentiate them on the basis of eṭuttal (rising) and paṭuttal (falling) ōcai.

> peruñ cey āṭavar = the valiant with great and noble action.[4]

Here Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar interprets the word 'cey' as action. He explains that it is a root standing as a verbal noun. Here therefore is paṭuttal ōcai though he does not specifically say so at this place.

> Vārtaru taṭam kaṇīr.[5]

In this line, the word vār (to shed) is used in its noun form, meaning vārtal (shedding) as understood from Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar's commentary Here also one has paṭuttal ōcai.

---

1. Tol. Col. Cēṉā; s. 415.
2. Tol. Col; s. 226, pp. 235-236.
3. Naṉṉūl, Civa; s. 132.
4. Neṭu; I. 171.
5. Jīvaka; v. 302.

8.2.5. *Quantity or length system of some roots*

The time-unit (mātrai) of 'u' suffix is one. The words ending with the full quantity (i.e. one mātrai) of 'u' are said to end in muṟṟiyal ukaram. The words ending with the reduced quantity of 'u' (i.e. ½ a mātrai) are said to end in kuṟṟiyalukaram (short 'u'). In words of the pattern 1, (c) v p u (where c is consonant; v is long vowel; v is a short vowel; the c within brackets shows that it may occur or not occur; p is a plosive, u is the vowel u) or 2. (c) v (c) c v (c) p u; the u becomes uu in these patterns. The Tamil Grammarians call this the shortened 'u'.[1]

kāṭu — c v p uu (Forest)

āṭu — v p uu (goat)

cuṉṉāmpu — (c) v (c) c v (c) p u

Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar tells us that the shortened 'uu' has no lip-rounding.[2] That is 'uu' (inverted m). Elsewhere the final 'u' is the ordinary 'u'. This will suggest that u and uu are combinatorial variants of the same phoneme 'u'. But in the age of Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar they seem to contrast.

kātu (attack) — an imperative.

kātuu (an ear) — a noun.

Here as elsewhere the imperative has eṭuttal ōcai and the noun the paṭuttal ōcai. But Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar explains that the contrast is due to the u and uu. Therefore he points out that they are contrasting. According to him muṟṟiyal ukaram and kuṟṟiyal ukaram should be taken as two different phonemes.[3] The question is whether one has to rely on the difference in the phonemes or the difference in eṭuttal paṭuttal ōcais. If one takes the eṭuttal ōcai as the basis then one has to explain the lengthening of the kuṟṟiyalukaram as due to ōcai. Here it is to be stated that kuṟṟiyalukaram and muṟṟiyalukaram were differentiated by putting a dot on the kuṟṟiyalukaram in the writing system of Tolkāppiyam,[4] but this differentiation was lost even by the time of Rāja Rāja Cōla and hence the importance of Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar's remarks on the differentiation according to meaning.

---

1. Tol. Eḻuttu; 36.
2. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 68.
3. Tol. Eḻuttu; ss. 36, 68.
4. Tol. Eḻuttu s. 2.
   Ibid; s. 105. Foot-notes, p. 112.

Let us now examine this in the light of Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar.[1]

Full u with one mātrai	Meaning (verb)	Short u (uu) ½ mātrai.	Meaning (noun)
1. Kaṭṭu	to bundle	kaṭṭu	a bundle
2. Kattu	to cry	kattuu	a cry
3. Murukku	to destroy	Murukku	destruction
4. Teruṭṭu	to clarify	Teruṭṭuu	a clarification
5. Tarukku	to pride	tarukkuu	pride

8.2.6. *Finite verbs and participial nouns*

The phrase "Eḻutten̲appaṭupa" may be a participial noun and also a finite verb.

1. Verb: "Eḻutten̲appaṭupa" — They will be known as alphabets.
2. Noun: "Eḻutten̲appaṭupa" — Those which will be known as alphabets.

Here the first 'paṭupa' is a finite verb. The second one is 'vin̲ai-yālaṇaiyum peyar' (participial noun). If 'paṭupa' is a finite verb it needs a subject. If it is a participial noun it requires a predicate.

Eḻutten̲ap paṭupa
Akara mutal n̲akara ir̲uvāy muppak ten̲pa.

Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar, interpreting the sūtram of Tolkāppiyar, takes 'Eḻutten̲appaṭupa' as subject and 'Akara mutal n̲akara ir̲uvāy muppak-tu' as predicate. So he interprets 'paṭupa' as denoting the 'vin̲aiyālaṇaiyum peyar' (participial noun). It is very difficult to find out the part of speech of the word 'paṭupa' mainly on the basis of the written letters. He interprets as usual that 'paṭupa' as a noun here has paṭuttal ōcai perhaps [2]paṭupa.[1 2]

The words nallan̲, tīyan, ciriyan̲, periyan̲, valiyan̲, meliyan̲, etc. may denote the finite verbs which denote tense by implication or the nouns derived from the noun roots like 'nal' etc., which are not predicates.

Nallan̲ vantān̲ — A good man came (noun)
Avan̲ nallan̲ — He is good (verb)

The finite verbs that are formed from the roots naṭa (walk), vā (come), cey (do), etc. denote the tense in a clear way and so they are

1. Tol. Eḻuttu; ss. 36, 68, 76, 105.
2. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 1.

called 'terinilai vinai murru' (finite verbs where tense is explicit or shortly 'explicit verbs'). The finite verbs that are formed from the nominal roots like nal (good), tī (bad), peri (big), etc. denote the tense only by implication. They are 'kurippu vinai murru' (i.e., finite verbs denoting tense by implication or shortly 'implicit verbs'). According to this definition the words like vantān (he came) which denote the tense are 'terinilai vinai murru' and the words like 'nallan' (is good) in which the tense is understood are 'kurippu vinai murru.' The same words like 'nallan' in the noun form or noun sense (good man) are called 'kurippu vinaiyālaṇaiyum peyar' meaning participial nouns with the tense understood. Here they are no better than pronouns. Naccinārkkiniyar differentiates these words by means of ōcai.[1]

[1]nallan[2] — eṭuttal ōcai — a finite verb.

[2]nallan[1] — paṭuttal ōcai — a participial noun.

So it is clear that only the ōcai is able to indicate the parts of speech of a word.

Some of the words denoting interrogation may either come as finite verbs or nouns. Naccinārkkiniyar indicates whether it is a noun or a verb only by differentiating the ōcais. The word 'evan' could be either a verb or a noun. In the noun form it has paṭuttal ōcai.[2] In the verbal form it must have eṭuttal ōcai.

[2]evan[1] — paṭuttal — noun
[1]evan[2] — eṭuttal — verb (predicate)

8.2.7. *Transitive and intransitive differentiated by ōcai*

Ōcai in the transitive and intransitive verbs has not been clearly defined. The same word can be used either as an intransitive or transitive verb.

kīru	— to receive a bruise	— to cause a bruise.
piḷa	— to break one self	— to break some other thing.
Citaru	— to scatter oneself	— to cause the scattering.
cintu	— to spill oneself	— to cause the spilling.

Naccinārkkiniyar says these roots are the same for both the intransitive and transitive verbs from the phonemic point of view.[3]

1. Tol. Col; s. 463, p. 469.
2. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 122.
3. Jīvaka; v. 31.

naliyum — to cause suffering.

'Naliyum' normally has its meaning only in the intransitive form. But Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar uses it in the transitive sense meaning "to cause suffering"[1].

'tēr̲r̲ēn̲' — I do not know.

tēr̲u-to know (intransitive). tēr̲r̲u-to let others know (transitive). But Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar interprets this word as meaning 'I do not know'.[2] (in the intransitive sense).

So it is evident that there is no clear cut indication to know whether a word is intransitive or transitive, from the way of writing. But there is a reference in the commentaries on Tolkāppiyam to the word 'tapu' which can be used both in the intransitive and in the transitive sense. The commentators, Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar and Iḷampūraṇar, explain that when the form (tapu) has the eṭuttal ōcai it is transitive and that when it has the paṭuttal ōcai it is intransitive.[3] According to them:

'tapu' — eṭuttal — To cause one to die.

'tapu' — paṭuttal -- you die.

A doubt arises at this stage. Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar has stated that the verb in the imperative mood will be pronounced with eṭuttal ōcai.[4] Tapu is also a verb in the imperative mood whether it has the transitive or intransitive sense. When therefore Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar states that the transitive 'tapu' will have an eṭuttal ōcai we are at a loss to know how the eṭuttal ōcai of the transitive imperative differs from the eṭuttal ōcai of the intransitive imperative. We have to assume that the transitive imperative will have a much more predominant eṭuttal ōcai than the eṭuttal ōcai of the intransitive imperative. For instance if the intonation for the intransitive imperative is from level 1 to level 2, the intonation of the transitive imperative may be from level 1 to level 3. There is also a statement which may be interpreted as reference to what modern Linguists like Hockett call 'Terminal contour'.[5]

With reference to naṭattuvi-the causal verb-it can occur as a verb in the imperative mood, when it is pronounced with an eṭuttal

1. Jīvaka; v. 641.
2. Ibid; v. 257.
3. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 76.
4. Tol. Col; s. 226, pp. 235-236.
5. A Course in Modern Linguistics; p. 34.

ōcai followed by a T. C. (Terminal contour) represented by inverted verticle arrow/ ↓ /., but this form can also occur in a finite verb followed by other suffixes as naṭattuvittā<u>n</u>. In this case according to Nacci<u>n</u>ārkki<u>n</u>iyar the final 'i' of naṭattuvi is pronounced with paṭu-ttal ōcai.[1] But the finite verb as shown with reference to 'ceyyum' will have eṭuttal ōcai[2] - that means we have three levels starting from-for instance-2 falling down to 1 and then rising upto 2 or 3 followed by a T. C./ ↓ /. Whether it is possible to assume the existence of pitch accent in Tamil instead of these pitch-levels is a matter for future research. The difference between naṭattu and naṭattuvi also should be explained by the pitch-levels being from 1 to 2 in naṭa-ttu but 2-1-2 in naṭattuvi.

8.2.8. *Second personal verb and imperative differentiated*

When the verbal roots take the suffix of the second person verb and imperative and become finite, they have two meanings:-

1. uṇpāy — you will eat — II person singular finite verb,
2. uṇpāy — do eat — II person singular verb imperative.

The first one refers to the idea that the person addressed will be engaged in the action of eating. The second one, on the other hand, orders the person addressed to eat.

Though they have the same phonemes they convey different meanings only by the different ōcais. But both of them are finite verbs and therefore have only the eṭuttal ōcai. However, Nacci<u>n</u>ārk-ki<u>n</u>iyar states that when this form denotes a command it is pronounced with an eṭuttal ōcai.[3] As already stated this must be an eṭuttal ōcai in comparison with the other eṭuttal ōcai of the verb in the indicative mood reaching a higher pitch level. If 'uṇpāy' as an indicative verb has the intonation rising from 1 to 2, 'uṇpāy' as an imperative verb will have the intonation rising from 1 to 3 or that the T. C. is a rising one represented by a vertically raised arrow.

^{1}uṇpāy^{2} — indicative verb

^{1}uṇpāy^{3} — imperative verb

8.2.9. *Affirmative and negative second personal verbs differentiated*

In the second personal finite verbs there are words which contain the same phoneme but they occur both in affirmative and negative

1. Tol. Col. s. 226, p. 237.
2. Tol. Col; 237, p. 265.
3. Tol. Col; s. 225.

sense. The word 'ceyyāy' with paṭuttal ōcai gives the affirmative sense. When this word occurs in the negative sense (you will not do), it has the eṭuttal ōcai.

^{1}uṇṇāy^{3} — you will not eat
2nd personal negative verb.

^{2}uṇṇāy^{1} — you will eat.
2nd personal affirmative verb.

Naccinārkkiniyar also holds the view that the word 'ceyyāy' usually occurs in the negative sense, though it occurs sometimes in the affirmative sense. He states that the word 'uṇṇāy' (you will eat) pronounced with paṭuttal ōcai occurs with reference to the idea of request and in the affirmative sense.[1] Also 'uṇṇāy' (you will not eat) is the negative form of the word uṇpāy (you will eat). The differentiation is shown by the different intonation patterns. Here also as in the affirmative sense and the negative sense the finite verbs have eṭuttal ōcai. but comparatively speaking the negative word has a higher eṭuttal ōcai. For instance.

^{1}uṇpāy^{2} — affirmative.

^{1}uṇṇāy^{3} — negative.

8.2.10 *Finite and non-finite verbs differentiated*

In Tamil there is the word 'ceyyum' which may occur either as a finite verb or as an infinite verb known as 'peyar eccam'. Though they are the same in orthography, Naccinārkkiniyar analyses how by a difference in the ōcai it could mean either a finite verb or an infinite one.

1. Cāttaṉ uṇṇum	— Cāttaṉ will eat.	—	finite.
2. Uṇṇum Cāttaṉ pātuvāṉ	— Cāttaṉ who eats will sing.	—	non-finite.

The former is a finite verb. The later one is non-finite verb. The former one has the eṭuttal ōcai, and the later one has the paṭuttal ōcai. Naccinārkkiniyar is able to distinguish them by different ōcais. He says that a finite verb has the eṭuttal ōcai and does not contemplate any further word for completing its idea and stands as compact as a box well closed by a lid, whereas if a word occurs in non-finite sense just as 'Vāḻum il' (the house where we live), 'Vāḻum' has the paṭuttal ōcai and does not complete its sense by the proximate word but has to be completed by another word 'naṉṟu'.

1. Tol. Col; ss. 450, 551.

Vāḷum il naṉṟu — (Living house (is) good)- The house where we live is good.

This is the definition of finite and infinite verbs.[1]

The above statement of Naccinārkkiniyar with reference to the finite and non-finite verbs should be taken as referring to the Terminal contour (TC). So according to him the finite verb has the eṭuttal ōcai and not depending on another word for completing its sense it has a terminal contour like that of a verticle inverted arrow / ↓ /. Non-finite verb has the paṭuttal ōcai and depending upon another word for completing its sense it has a terminal contour like Hockett's vertical bar / ↑ /.[2] The word 'vantāṉ' (he came) by its eṭuttal ōcai indicates the finite verb, by its paṭuttal ōcai shows this participal noun. In some cases the paṭuttal ōcai has the terminal contour / ↓ /, but not always, for instance the imperative positive 'uṇṇāy' though having comparatively a paṭuttal ōcai has only the Terminal contour / ↓ /, because nothing follows thereafter.[3]

8.2.11. *Some verbal forms common to many parts of speech differentiated by ōcai*

There are certain other verbs which have the same phonemes, but in meaning are finite verbs or non-finite verbs. The word 'iyala' is an instance in particular.

'Iyala' 1. '(they) were of that nature' — finite verb.
2. 'those that have that nature' — noun.
3. 'those which have the nature' — relative participle.
4. 'to move' — verbal participle.

Naccinārkkiniyar interprets a Tolkāppiyam sūtram in Eḷuttatikāram, holding it as a 'viṉaieccam' or verbal participle.[4] We are not concerned with the meaning of the word here, but we are investigating the way by which Naccinārkkiniyar interprets this word on the basis of the difference in ōcai.

Naccinārkkiniyar says, 'iyala', as a verbal participle, has paṭuttal ōcai. He also says that it should be considered here as 'ceyaveṉ eccam', implying therefore that this word can occur also

---

1. Tol. Col; s. 237, p. 265
2. A Course in Modern Linguistics; p. 35.
3. Supra; 8. 2.9.
4. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 50.

as a finite verb. As he says that in the non-finite sense it has the paṭuttal ōcai. So, from Naccinārkkiniyar's interpretation of the word 'iyala', again it becomes certain that non-finite verb has a paṭuttal ōcai and it depends upon another word for completing its sense. This will mean that the Terminal Contour as in non-finite, ceyyum has also the Terminal Contour / ↑ /.

8.3. *Juncture*

We have been so far dealing with homophonous words differing in meaning because of different ōcai. Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar also analyses homophonous phrases or constructions which because of the juncture occurring at different places give different meanings. Tolkāppiyar refers to these homophonous phrases or constructions as:

Eḷuttōran̲n̲a poruḷ teri pun̲arcci".[1]

8.3.1. *The two major groups of Juncture*

The ancient grammarians have discussed at length the kinds of juncture or sandhi and classified them under two major groups.[2]

1. Oṭṭi muṭital — which may be compared with close juncture or Muddy Transition.
2. Piḷantu muṭital — which may be compared with open juncture or Sharp transition.

Oṭṭimuṭital (close juncture) means two or more words that are so proximately and homogeneously aligned together and have the characteristic of one word as in real compounds when we have root compounds. Piḷantu muṭital (open juncture) means two or more words that are hetrogeneously aligned and retain their respective characteristics as in phrasal compounds or phrases. In the case of close or muddy juncture no symbol is used by modern linguists whilst for open juncture the symbol (+) is used.

8.3.2. *Juncture as a phoneme*

There are words that give meaning in (1) close juncture, (2) open juncture, (3) two different meanings if accented as close juncture or open juncture (4) accented in two different kinds of open juncture, give two different meanings, as understood from the following examples:

---

1. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 141.
2. Tol. Eḷuttu; ss. 110. 132; Tol. Col; s. 412.

(1) Karuṅkutirai — black horse is a case of close juncture.[1]

(2) Irā-p-pakal — 'night and day' is a case of open juncture.[2]

(3) Uḷporuḷ

(a) uḷporuḷ — the existence—thing—(close juncture).

(b) uḷ + poruḷ — The thing exists—open juncture.[3]

(4) Cempu + o\u0331npatin\u0331r\u0331oṭi — copper nine palams.

Cempo\u0331n + patin\u0331r\u0331oṭi — gold ten palams.[4]

(5) Pulikon\u0331r\u0331a + yān\u0331ai — the elephant killed by a tiger.

Puli + kon\u0331r\u0331ayān\u0331ai — the elephant which killed a tiger.[5]

(6) uṇṭu + viruntoṭu vantān\u0331 — ate and came with a guest.

uṇṭu viruntoṭu + vantān\u0331 — ate with a guest and came.[6]

These could be discussed under the analysis of immediate conotituents. There is no sandhi change. In 'cempon\u0331patin\u0331r\u0331oṭi' sandhi changes by which 'u' of cempudisappears gives the homophonous phrase. This complication can be resolved by admitting the juncture phoneme as occuring in different pharases. In view of this, juncture may be taken as a phoneme.

8.3.3. *Meanings understood through intonation*

Naccin\u0331ārkkin\u0331iyar analyses these various aspects of juncture and explains them at length. Tolkāppiyar says that one sentence could have different meaning only through 'icai-t-tiripu' (difference in ōcai) as the juncture or pause.[7] According to Tolkāppiyar, in Tamil where there are changes due to rules of Sandhi, it is not the practice to break up the sentences to retain the individual physical form of each word, but the different meanings can be understood not through orthographic writing but through proper intonation only.[8]

---

1. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 110.
2. Ibid;
3. Ibid; s. 430.
4. Tol. Eḻuttu s. 141.
5. Tol. Col; ss. 96, 97.
6. Ibid; s. 239.
7. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 141.
8. Ibid; s. 142.

8.3.4. *Is there any pitch difference?*

It is for consideration whether the initial of a word has any other pitch difference since Naccinārkkiniyar speaks of eṭuttal, paṭuttal, nalital differences in this place.[1] It has been noted when explaining the ōcai or intonation of naṭattuvi and naṭattuvittā<u>n</u>, that in the former, the pitch level of 'i' is higher than the pitch level of 'i' in the latter. This is because the latter comes in the middle of a word. Similarly one may assume that in 'cempo<u>n</u>pati<u>n</u><u>r</u>oṭi" the 'o' has a pitch level lower when it is part of cempo<u>n</u> than when it is the begining of a word o<u>n</u>patu. As already stated there is some connection between pitch and ōcai at least in some place wherein the paṭuttal and terminal contour will occur. But this has to be left to further research.

8.3.5. *Meanings understood by context*

Nacci<u>n</u>ārkki<u>n</u>iyar says that the different meanings of a construction can be best understood only by context. 'Cempo<u>n</u> pati<u>n</u><u>r</u>oṭi'—when we are discussing gold, the sentence has reference only to gold, but in a different context, when we are discussing copper it has reference only to copper.[2] "It is possible for a single sequence of segmental morphemes to have two alternative organisations, usually with a difference of meaning. Sometimes, but not always, the ambiguity is removed by intonation or other context...But in the sentence "He was dancing with the stout major's wife" (with certain of the possible distributions of stress and intonation) we cannot tell whether the man's dancing partner is stout or not ..Ambiguity is often eliminated by context. The stout major's wife is very thin. The stout major's wife has a very thin husband."[3] The context helps the analysis of immediate constituents. See the case of 'puli ko<u>n</u><u>r</u>a yā<u>n</u>ai' and 'uṇṭu viruntoṭu vantā<u>n</u>' mentioned earlier.

8.3.6 *Oṭṭimuṭital (close juncture)*

There are six types of compounds where the case signs and other suffixes are understood (elided). They are called:

1. Vē<u>r</u><u>r</u>umai-t-tokai.
2. Vi<u>n</u>ai-t-tokai.
3. Paṇpu-t-tokai.
4. Uvamai-t-tokai.
5. Ummai-t-tokai.
6. A<u>n</u>moḻi-t-tokai.

---

1. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 142.
2. Ibid; s. 142.
3. A Course in Modern Linguistics; pp. 152-153.

A tokai is evidently that which is made up of two or more words which functions together as one word.[1] Among these, vinai-t-tokai, paṇpu-t-tokai and anmoḷi-t-tokai come under the first variety of juncture namely 'oṭṭi muṭital' (Close juncture). As Tolkāppiyar refers to vinai-t-tokai (e.g. kolyānai meaning 'killing elephant'), and paṇpu-t-tokai (e.g. 'veḷyāṟu' meaning ('white river') as 'maruvin pāttiya' (inflexional types), Naccinārkkiniyar holds these compounds as single entities and treats them as a word. In the same way he considers anmoḷi-t-tokai as a single word.[2] There are instances where he treats these as single words.[3] Civañāna munivar refuses to accept this theory and does not treat them as single words.[4] But there are modern scholars who have held that such compounds can be treated as single words. "At the other extreme we find forms which lie on the border between words and phrases. A form like 'black bird' resembles a two word phrase—(black-bird), but we shall find that a consistent description of English is bound to class this form as a single (compound) word...ice cream, spoken with only one high stress, will be classified as a (compound) word".[5] But it is not possible to speak of any stress unifying compound in Tamil. Further the analysis of compounds has taken a new trend in modern linguistics especially in its newly developed generative grammar.

1.	Kolyānai	— killing elephant	— vinai-t-tokai.
2.	Karuṅ kutirai	— Black horse.	— paṇpu-t-tokai.
3.	Poṟṟoṭi.	— The lady with gold bangles.	— Anmoḷi-t-tokai.

The first two are explained by Tolkāppiyar himself as indivisible compounds where the first parts appear only in their bound forms. But Naccinārkkiniyar adds anmoḷi-t-tokai (e.g. 3) also as oṭṭi muṭital but the basis for this is not clear. He states that anmoḷi-t-tokai has no other constituent.

8.3.7. *Piḷantu muṭital (open juncture)*

Vēṟṟumai-t-tokai, uvamai-t-tokai and ummai-t-tokai are piḷantu muṭital according to Naccinārkkiniyar.[6] Perhaps one has to write as follows:

1. Tol. Col; s. 420.
2. Tol. Eḻuttu; ss. 24, 110.
3. Ibid; ss. 24, 26, 29.
4. Nannūl; s. 152, p. 116.
5. Language; p. 180.
6. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 110, Tol. Col; s. 421.

1. Poṟ+ṟoṭi — gold bangles — Vēṟṟumai-t-tokai
2. Mati+mukam — moon (like) face — uvamai-t-tokai
3. Irā-p+pakal — night (and) day — ummai-t-tokai

8.3.8. *The juncture of the phrases where the suffixes are not elided*

The other important constructions are:

1. Eḻuvāy-t-toṭar — Subject construction.
2. Viṉai muṟṟu-t-toṭar — Predicate Construction.
3. Peyar ecca-t-toṭar — Relative participle construction.
4. Viṉai-ecca-t-toṭar — Verbal participle construction.

Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar says that peyar-ecca-t-toṭar and viṉai-ecca-t-toṭar each of them, behave like one word[1] or in modern linguistics, an immediate constituent. But these phrases, like some other compounds which we have already examined, have to be taken as piḷantu muṭital.

1. Uṇṭa+Cāttaṉ+vantāṉ— (Cāttaṉ who ate came)— Peyar ecca-t-toṭar. (nominal construction)[2]
2. Uṇṭu+vanṭāṉ+Cāttaṉ— (Cāttaṉ ate and came) — Viṉai ecca-t-toṭar. (verbal construction)[3]
3. Vēy+nīṇṭatu — (Bamboo got elongated)— Eḻuvāy-t-toṭar. Subject construction.[4]
4. Vēy+yātu — (Which is bamboo?) Subject construction.[5]

8.3.9 *Two kinds of compound*

Tolkāppiyar says that aṉmoḻi-t-tokai can be formed out of vēṟṟumai-t-tokai, paṇpu-t-tokai and ummai-t-tokai.[6] Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar says that aṉmoḻi-t-tokai can be formed out of viṉai-t-tokai and uvamai-t-tokai also.[7] The juncture according to Nacciṉārkkiṉi yar is as follows:

1. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 110.
2. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 110.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid; s. 29, p. 61.
5. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 29, p. 61.
6. Tol. Col; s. 448, p. 407.
7. Ibid; s. 448, p. 408.

1.	Poṟ+ṟoṭi	— gold bangles	— veṟṟumai-t-tokai.
	Poṟṟoṭi	— the lady wearing gold bangles	— aṉmoḷi-t-tokai.
2.	Mati+ mukam	— moon (like) face	— uvamai-t-tokai,
	Matimukam	— the lady with moon like face	— aṉmoḷi-t-tokai.
3.	Uyir+mey	— life (and) body (vowel and consonant)	— ummai-t-tokai.
	Uyirmey	— the vowel consonant	— aṉmoḷi-t-tokai.

So it is obvious these tokais (vēṟṟumai, uvamai and ummai) as above are piḷantumuṭital.[1] Aṉmoḷi-t-tokai even when born of vēṟṟumai, etc. has oṭṭi muṭital.[2] So vēṟṟumai-t-tokai, uvamai-t-tokai, and ummai-t-tokai when they occur as such have 'piḷantu muṭital' and when they occur as aṉmoḷi-t-tokai have 'oṭṭi miṭital'. This distinction with reference to aṉmoḷi is not clear.

4.	Veḷḷāṭai	— white cloth	— Paṇpu-t-tokai.
	Veḷḷāṭai	— the person with white cloth	— Aṉmoḷi-t-tokai.
5.	Tāḷkūntal	— the hair that is long	— Viṉai-t-tokai.
	Tāḷkūntal	— the woman with long hair.	— Aṉmoḷi-t-tokai.

As far as these two (paṇpu and viṉai-t-tokai) have oṭṭi muṭital we are not able to find out whether they occur as paṇpu-tokai or aṉmoḷi-t-tokai because both are oṭṭi mutital.[3] Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar has recourse to ōcai. He says that when the same form occurs as paṇpu-t-tokai etc., it has a different ōcai whilst it has paṭuttal ōcai when occuring as aṉmoḷi-t-tokai.[4] The first three can be distinguished from aṉmoḷi both by juncture and ōcai. The former have juncture whilst the latter (aṉmoḷi) has no juncture. It has only paṭuttal ōcai.

---

1. Supra; 8.3.7.
2. Ibid; 8.3.6.
3. Supra; 8.3.6.
4. Tol. Col; s. 418.

CHAPTER - 9

SYNTAX

9.1. *Sentences*

9.1.1. *Morphology and syntax*

"The details of Syntax are often complicated and hard to describe. On this point any fairly complete grammar of a language like English, German or Latin or French, will prove more enlightening than would an abstract discussion. Syntax is obscured, however, in most treatises by the use of philosophical instead of formal definitions of constructions and form classes."[1] But Tolkāppiyar had enunciated the principles of morphology and syntax fairly clearly in his grammar. We are not concerned with the sūtrams of Tolkāppiyam as much as we are with Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar's commentary on them. Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar has, at many places, dealt with the principles of syntax, basing his findings mainly on Tolkāppiyam and it is with these that we are concerned. This chapter does not attempt a study of Tamil syntax as a whole but deals only with Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar's main observation on the subject.

9.1.2. *Word Definition*

The grammar of words is called 'Morphology' and the grammar of sentences is called Syntax. It is very difficult to draw the line of partition between the two. "The Morphology-Syntax Boundary. The line of demarcation between Morphology and Syntax is not always clear cut......".[2] The word is formed by the sequence of letters. Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar says that though the words are pronounced letter by letter, yet they give at a glance the complete picture of meaning, the letters appearing simultaneously.[3] Evidently he is against sphotavada.

---

1. Language; p. 201.

2. A course in Modern Linguistics; p, 178.

3. Tol. Col; s. 1.

9.1.3. *Sentence-Definition*

What Naccinārkkiniyar says of the 'word' applies to sentences also. All the words in a sentence cannot be pronounced simultaneously, but only one word after another, and yet the sentence gives meaning only when the words are understood simultaneously.[1] "The essential method of speech consists in presenting to the listener successsive word signs each possessing a definite area of meaning. Employing these clues, the listener reconstructs the thing meant by an effort of his intelligence, using the situation as an additional inference".[2]

9.1.4. *Taḻuvu toṭar (Phrase in which a word qualifies the word immediately following it)*

The words in their meaningful sequence from a phrase, and the phrase in their significant continuity form a sentence. The words that form the meaningful sequence or continuity, by their occurrence in their order, provide or make up 'immediate constituent'. "A constituent is any word or construction (or morpheme) which enters into some larger construction. An immediate constituent is one, or two, or a few constituents of which any given construction is directly formed".[3] The words or phrases that do not occur in their meaningful sequence are not consituents.

9.1.5. *Taḻāttoṭar (Phrase in which a word does not qualify or govern the word immediately following it)*

However 'a man are' occurring in "the sons and daughters of a man are his children" do not form immediate constituents. "The sons and daughters of a man" from one unit or constituent; "are his children" form another constituent. Then these constituents become two immediate constituents. We find a similar definition of a constituent in the commentary of Naccinārkkiniyar at many places.[4]

"Irumpu tirittanna māyiru maruppiṟ

Paral aval aṭaiya iralai teṟippa".

Here 'maruppiṟ paral' are two words that occur in a sequence. 'Maruppu' means 'horns', 'paral' means 'stones'. An interpretation of the same as such would mean "stones with horns", which is ridiculous. So it is clear that 'maruppu' becomes significant only if it is

1. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 108.
2. The Theory of Speech and Language; p. 195.
3. An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics; pp. 132-133.
4. Tol. Eḻuttu. s. 111.

read with 'iralai' (deer), that is 'the deer with horns', and this word 'iralai' occurs in the succeeding line "maruppin̲ iralai" form one immediate constituent.

"Karuṅkāl ōmai-k-kāṇpin̲ peruñcin̲ai". Here 'ōmai-k-kāṇpin̲' gives no meaning, but 'ōmai-c-cin̲ai' (the branch of the ōmai tree) gives the relevant meaning. Therefore 'ōmai' is one constituent, 'kāṇpin̲ peruñcin̲ai' is another constituent. Then both form one constituent. 'Ōmai' however is not an immediate constituent of 'kāṇpin̲'.

"Teyva māl varai"-Here 'teyva' and 'māl' are not immediate constituents but only 'teyva' and 'varai' (divine mountain); 'māl' becomes a constituent with 'varai' and then 'mālvarai' as a constituent, becomes one with the 'teyva', its other immediate constituent.

9.1.6. *Constituents in verses*

As against the ordinary usage, versification and poetic inversion require certain distant links not contemplated in prose or speech where words in one place become immediate constituents with words further removed. There are two kinds of constituents in verses according to Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar.[1]

1. Moḻi mār̲r̲u.
2. Māṭṭu.

Moḻimār̲r̲u occurs in two lines.

"Kuraṅkuḷai-p-polinta koy cuvar̲ puravi
Naram pārppan̲n̲a vāṅku vaḷ parīya"

Here the word 'puravi' (horse) does not go in with the next word 'narampu' (strings), but with 'vaḷ' (reins) only. 'Puravi vaḷ' means the reins of the horse.

9.1.7. *Māṭṭu*

Māṭṭu also occurs only in a verse. Here a word goes and forms an immediate constituent with a word occurring several lines hence. This māttu can be subdivided into two accoding to Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar.

1. Proximate māṭṭu.
2. Distant māṭṭu.

---

1. Tol. Col; s. 409, p. 387.

9.1.8. *Proximate māṭṭu*

Proximate māṭṭu is that which occurs in a verse consisting of several lines.

Poṉṉōṭai-p-pukar aṇi nutal
Tuṉṉarun tiṟal kamaḷ kaṭāattu
Eyiṟu paṭaiyāka eyiṟ kataviṭāa-k-
kayiṟu piṇi-k-koṇṭa kaviḷ maṇi maruṅkiṉ
Peruṅkai yāṉai-y–irum piṭar-t-talai-y-iruntu
Maruntil kūṟṟat tarun toḻil cāyā.

This is the description of an elephant. Here nutal, tiṟal, kaṭām, maruṅku, kai (forehead, strength, katām, side, trunk) are all attributes for the word 'yāṉai' (elephant). As all the words occur proximately, Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar calls it 'proximate māṭṭu'. Nutal, kaṭām, kaḷuttu, maruṅkul, kai form a coordinate construction. All these then become one constituent to form an immediate constituent with yāṉai. What precedes each one of these viz., "nutal, kaṭām, maruṅku, and kai are immediate constituents only respectively with 'nutal' etc. So much so 'nutal' does not form an immediate constituent with the next word.

9.1.9 *Distant māṭṭu*

Distant māṭṭu is that which occurs in a verse containing a sequence of hundred and more lines. Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar gives examples of this from Tirumurukāṟṟuppaṭai and other poems.[1] Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar analyses them bearing in mind the sutrams of Tolkāppiyam. Others condemn his examples here and elsewhere as unnatural. This does not form part of ordinary syntax and therefore this need not be discussed here.

9.2. *Major types of Sentences*

Sentences may be two in number. (1) Sentence consisting of only one word "taṉi moḻi" which may be called sentence word (2) Sentence consisting of more than one word-toṭar moḻi.[2] A sentence word according to convention (as found in a dictionary) gives meaning according to Cēṉāvaraiyar. Hockett speaks of favourite sentence

1. Pattu-p-pāṭṭu; p. 39.
Jīvaka; vv. 104, 1266-1273.
2. Tol. Col; s. 1, p. 3.

type and minor type (fragments).[1] The verbs of command like naṭa (walk), vā (comes), pō (go), cey (do) etc. the interrogatives, exclamations are all sentence words. The imperative verbs occurring as such give meanings and this is exemplified by Dr. M. Varadarajan with many illustrations.[2]

9.2.1 *Tanimoḻi (Sentence words)*

The predicates without subjects can give meanings, as understood from Naccinārkkiniyar's commentary.[3] This is contemplated by Tolkāppiyar himself in 69 (col). It is on this basis the tani moḻi and toṭar moḻi have been used in this essay in this peculiar sense.

> Cāttan enna ceykiṟāṉ?
> (What does Cāttan do?)
> Pāṭukiṟāṉ.
> (Sings)

'Pāṭukiṟāṉ'—Here in this word the III person singular suffix also occurs. Similarly in other languages also there are verbs occurring as sentence words, in which the actor and the action are denoted by bound forms which make up a single word, and these verbs, without apparent subjects are treated as favourite sentences.[4]

Not only affirmative but also negative predicates have the sucjects 'understood', and occur as 'sentence words'. The morphemes referring to the negative sense come in that bound form in Tamil in which there is the unique negative mood or voice. Vārāṉ (He will not come). This is so in other languages also.[5]

9.2.2. *Toṭar moḻi (sentence of more than one word)*

Words more than one in succession are called "toṭar moḻi". There are two kinds of Toṭar moḻi-(1) Two word constructions and (2) multi-word constructions. All these constructions may be brought under three classifications according to the grammarians.[6]

---

1. A course in Modern Linguistics; pp. 200-201.
2. Moḻinūl; pp. 319-322.
3. Tol. col. s. 69.
4. A course in Modern Linguistics; pp. 202-203.
5. Language; p. 175.
6. Tol. Col; s. 1. p. 4.

1.	Payaṉilaittoṭar	— e.g. Cāttaṉ vantāṉ
	(Predicate construction) —	(Cāttaṉ came)
2.	Tokainilaittoṭar	— e.g. Yāṉai-k-kōṭu
	(Attributive construction) —	(Elephant tusk)
3.	Eṇṇunilai-t-toṭar	— e.g. Nilam, nīr.
	(Coordinate construction) —	(Earth, water).

They follow the variety of exocentric and endocentiric types as enunciated by modern linguists. According to them predicative construction is exocentric and the attributive and coordinate constructions are endocentric.[1]

9.3. *Eḻuvāy Payaṉilai-t-toṭar* (*Subject-Predicate construction*)

This is very important among the various sentence types. This consists of the subject and predicate. In Tamil the subject is considered as the most important among the cases and therefore it is designated the first case (Mutal or 'Eḻuvāy vēṟṟumai'). It has already been pointed out that the predicate construction can occur with the predicate alone without the subject.[2] Hence its importance in Tamil. "The kernal of an English sentence of the favorite sentence type is a predicative constitute. This is true also in most other languages and quite possibly in all, though there are subsidiary differences to be noted shortly".[3]

9.3.1. *Different kinds of grammatical predicates in Tamil*

Tolkāppiyar classifies the predicate words occuring in a Tamil sentence. In Tamil there is no copula. Tamil predicates not of the action type have to be translated with a copula in English. Leaving aside the predicate construction we may analyse the predicates and subjects.

1. word affirming merely the existence of a thing.
2. word expressing the implied command.
3. word expressing the action of the subject.
4. an interrogative word.
5. word expressing the characteristic feature of the subject.[4]

---

1. Language; pp. 194-195, A Course in Modern Linguistics; pp. 184-186.
2. Supra; 9,2.1.
3. A Course in Modern Linguistics; P.201
4. Tol; Col.s. 67.

9.3.2. *Additional varieties of predicates*

Naccinārkkiniyar adds a few more to the varieties mentioned by Tolkāppiyar.[1] For example:

(1) A noun which occurs as the predicate, whereas in the above mentioned cases there was only one subject Head word. This happens according to Naccinārkkiniyar, when two nouns occur in the subject spot and when they denote the same thing without the one becoming subordinate to the other.

Āyan Cāttan vantān.

Linguists call this 'Appositional type'. The term apposition is used when practically joined forms are grammatically, but not in meaning, equivalent, e.g. "John, the poor boy". When the appositional group appears in an included position, one of its members is equivalent to a parenthesis. "John, the poor boy, ran away". In English we have also close apposition without a pause pitch, as in King John, John Brown, Mount Everest, etc."[2] In the sentence "Āyan Cāttan vantān", the subject 'Āyan Cāttan' is a close apposition.

(2) This is a variation of the appositional construction mentioned above. Here the two nouns do not come before the predicate; one comes before and the other comes after the predicate.

e.g. Āyan vantān Cāttan.

(3) This belongs to an important construction as in English sentences where the predicate is "became". Here the predicate (the word ā) takes an attribute.

e.g. Cāttan talaivan āyinān.

Talaivan is attribute of a meaning 'to become'.

(4) This is peculiar to Tamil. When there is something to be predicated of a limb or part of a whole, Tamil idiom allows it to be predicated of the whole. When one wants to say "The eyes are good" in Tamil one can say "He is good (in the) eyes" To differentiate "Cāttan nallan" "Cāttan is good", in cases under discussion we have "Cāttan kaṇ nallan" when the part viz., the "Kaṇ" occurs as an attribute of the predicate 'nallan'.

(5) The (a) thing and its quality (b) the thing and its action may be similarly treated.

1. Tol. Col; s. 67.
2. Language; P. 186.

'maṇi naṉṟu', "the gem is good"

'niṟam naṉṟu', "the colour is good"

One may have 'maṇi niṟam naṉṟu', "the gem is good in colour". This has to be distinguished. 'maṇi niṟam naṉṟu', "the colour of the gem is good" 'where maṇi and niṟam' become one constituent where the construction under discussion, 'niṟam' and 'naṉṟu' become one constituent.

(6) kutirai naṉṟu = The horse is good.

naṭai naṉṟu = The gait of walking is good.

kutirai naṭai naṉṟu = The horse is good in its gait.

Again this is different from kutirai naṭai naṉṟu = The walk of the horse is good" where 'kutirai naṭai' from one constituent whereas in the example under discussion "naṭai naṉṟu" becomes one constituent as distinct from 'kutirai'.

(7) āṟu oḻukum = the river flows.

nīr oḻukum = the water flows.

āṟu nīr oḻukum= This river flows with water.

Naccinārkkiṉiyar takes the river to refer to the place whilst the flow is really of the water therein. Here also nīr and oḻukum form one constituent; āru and nīr if they were to become one constituent would take the form āṟṟu nīr, āṟṟu nīr oḻukum, "The water of the river flows".

(8) The subject itself may be a phrase with a subject and predicate. Then the whole as one constituent occupies the subject spot and takes another predicate as its immediate constituent, so as to form a constituent of a whole sentence.

'Iṟaivaṉ aruḷiṉāṉ', "the Lord bestowed His Grace". This is nominalised as 'Iṟaivaṉ aruḷal'. Iṟaivaṉ is the subject of aruḷal. But Iṟaivaṉ aruḷal has become one constituent to fill up the subject in the longer step and becomes a constituent to go with the immediate constituent, "em uyir kākkum", the predicate phrase, so as to form a more comprehensive sentence or immediate constituent.

(9) Since the phrase becomes one constituent and functions as a subject or noun, it can also be expected to take a case sign.

Iṟaivaṉ aruḷiṉ yām uyir vāḻtum.

"If God blesses us, we can live our life". The analysis is similar to (8), except for the fact the phrase there functioned like a noun in the nominative case, while here it functions like a noun in the third case. No further statement need be made.

(10) These relate to the fact that the predicate, which ordinarily follows a subject, can precede a subject. In the former case the grammarians call it 'eḷuvāy-t-toṭar'; in the latter it is called 'viṉai muṟṟu-t-toṭar'.

e.g. 1. ā celka — eḷuvāy-t-toṭar. (Subject construction).
2. celka ā — viṉai muṟṟu-t-toṭar. (Predicate construction).

9.3.3. *Types of subjects*

The subject in the "subject-predicate construction" is called 'kartā' (actor). The person who does a thing is usually called the doer or actor. But Tolkāppiyar says that sometimes the object or goal can also occur as 'kartā'.[1] Here Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar adds that the instrument of the action and the commander of the action can also occur as 'kartā' (actor or doer).

1. Cāttaṉ pāṭiṉāṉ (Cāttaṉ sang) —karuttākkaruttā (i.e. actor occurs as actor)
2. Illam meḷukiṟṟu (House (was) cleaned) —karumakkaruttā (the object occurring as subject)
   Arici aṭṭatu (Rice (was) cooked) — karumakkaruttā (the object occurring as subject)
3. Ivvāḷ eṟiyum (The sword cuts) — karuvikkaruttā (instrument occurring as actor)
4. Aracaṉ eṭutta ālayam (king constructed temple) — ētukkaruttā (one who commands occurs as though he is the actor where one must have stated that the king has directed the construction of the temple)

Here we find a specific aspect of the Tamil language; when the objects and other things occur as 'karuttā', because in Tamil idiomatic usage generally, the verbs are used not in the passive sense, but in the active sense or rather in the pseudo active sense.

1. Tol. Col; s. 248.

9.3.4. *Commander actor*

Naccinārkkiniyar, bearing in mind all the points mentioned above, refers to the grammatical peculiarities and subtletics of words making a sentence in poetry. Vijayai, after being delivered of Jīvakan, reaches the Taṇṭakāraṇya forest and stays in the monastery of the Rishis. There the saintly women welcome her and the poet says "Nallaṇi nīkkukinrār."[1] meaning, as it is in the construction- "they removed her jewels". This does not sound well. Why should they remove her jewels instead of her removing them herself? Naccinārkkiniyar explains that here it means the saintly women directed the removal of the jewels and Vijayai removed them. This is like No.4 in the types of subjects above. Naccinārkkiniyar makes this clear by stating that it is like "Aracar eṭutta tēvakulam". i.e. the temple constructed by the king-in which the commander occurs as the doer.

9.3.5. *Noun occurring as predicate*

There is a line in Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi where the author describes the qualities of the women of chastity.

Kāmanai enruñ collār
Kaṇavar kai toḷutu vāḻvār
Tēmalar-t-tiruvōṭu oppār
Cērntavan cellal tīrppār.[2]

Here there are four predicative endings.

1. (they) will not mention the name of kāma.
2. will worship only the husband.
3. will be like Lakshmi for the husband.
4. will relieve the husband of his troubles.

But here the subject, 'the women of chastity' has not occured. But Naccinārkkiniyar makes the two words "collār and vaḷvār" together as the subject and oppār and tīrppār as predicates. He justifies this by referring to Tolkāppiyam rules where Tolkāppiyar has mentioned "nouns occurring as predicates" ("peyar koḷa varutal").[3]

9.4. *Attribute construction*

9.4.1. *Ambiguities removed*

In Tamil the attribute precedes the 'head'. But there are places where the attribute succeeds the 'head' and Naccinārkkiniyar's

1. Jīvaka;348.
2. Jīvaka; v. 1598.
3. Tol. Col; s. 67.

interpretation shows how the displacement of the attribute heightens the significance of the passage.

A dog beaten by the Brahmins is having the death-pangs and Jīvakaṉ helps the dog. The poet describes this thus.

"Ekiṉam maṟam illatu
kāṇṭalum kaluḷintiṭṭāṉ"[1]

Here 'ekiṉam'-dog-head word. Maṟam illatu–that which is harmless-attribute. It should be,

'Maṟam illātu ekiṉam'

It means harmless dog. (But even here it has to be taken as subject and predicate or as they may be in appositional construction. The appositional construction has a tendency to become attribute construction). The Brahmins who beat it have done the harm. Naccināṟkkiṉiyar, without interpreting it as 'harmless dog', explains this in the same fashion as the sentence is in the verse. "Jīvakaṉ seeing the dog in the harmless state" – This heightens the beauty of the line. The harmless state is the condition which evokes pity and the scene is very touching. So Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar does not change attributive phrase to suit the Syntax of Tamil Grammar, but sees beauty in this apparent violation (i.e. the attribute succeeding the head word). This type of attribute, which is more important than the head word, by its succession is found elsewhere in other works also.[2] But this is in accordance with the explanation (8) which he gives to the new kinds of occurrences of subject.

There is another place where Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar changes the position of the attribute bringing it to its natural place, and thus increases the beauty of the line.

"Paṇṇār pāymā
Iṇai yātum illāta, kaṇṇīr vīḻttu
uṇṇā niṉṟiṉiantatāmē"[3]

'The horses shedding tears wept". "Iṇai yātum illāta" means "having no equal". But it occurs like this:

"Horses unequal shedding tears wept".

Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar changes this as, 'unequal horses shedding tears

1. Jīvaka; v. 942.
2. Puṟam; v. 100. Commentator's introduction.
3. Jīvaka; v. 2968.

wept'. The phrase as it is (unequalled . . tears) looks ridiculous and Naccinārkkiniyar does not want to leave it at that, and the shifting of one of the attributes to its natural place in giving the implication of reason makes it charming, replete with sense.

'Paṇṇār pāymā' is the subject phrase; 'iṇai yātum illāta' is the predicate phrase. Then the whole becomes a constituent and occurs as the subject of 'iṉaintatāmē'. What is important is that the word 'illāta' cannot be the immediate constituent of 'kaṇṇīr'. What Naccinārkkiniyar says here can be explained in this way.

9.4.2. *The homophonous construction resolved*

Sometimes there may be words between the attribute and the head and this may create confusion in connecting the attribute with the head. But Naccinārkkiniyar explains with what other word a particular word phrase becomes a constituent.

Ilaṅku pūṇ alaṅkal mārpiṉ
Ceṟṟavaṟ-c-cekutta vai vēl
Cīvakacāmi.[1]

Here 'Cīvakacāmi' - the head. Pūṇ (jewels), mārpu (chest), and vēl (Javaline) are the attributes. There occurs a word 'ceṟṟavar' in the middle, meaning 'enemies'. The line, interpreted as it stands, may mean that the attributes 'pūṇ and mārpu' go to describe the word 'ceṟṟavar' (enemies) of Jīvakaṉ. This passage is the statement of Vijaiyai in praise of her son Jīvakaṉ. In this context it looks absurd that she should praise the enemies of Jīvakaṉ, her son. So Naccinārkkiniyar explains here that the attributes have Jīvakaṉ as the head which forms a constituent with those immediate constitutents "ceṟṟavar-c-cekutta vai vēl" forms one constitutent. It is possible to interpret this to refer to the enemies of Jīvaka, endowed with jewels and grandlands i.e. making the first two attributes for 'ceṟṟavar' (enemies) - as this can also imply "endowed with jewels and garlands but not with courage". This will be ironical and may have some literary appeal. But, to say they have no courage does not do any justice to the valour of Jīvakaṉ, who defeats them all at the end. So Naccinārkkiniyar's interpretation seems to be the best under the circumstances.

9.4.3. *A Series of attributes - non-ambiguous*

In literary works sometimes the attributes occur in succession and describe the head which occurs at the end. Naccinārkkiniyar interprets such passages with great clarity.

---

1. Jīvaka; v. 2609.

"Maṇi mur̲uval/murukkital koṭippavaḷa-t-
taḷaṅku kural vāy".[1]

Here 'vāy' (mouth) is the head. Three attributes have come to describe it. Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar explains each attribute independently as referring or applicable to the head.

Pearl like smiling mouth.
Murukku petal and coral-like mouth.
Melodious voiced mouth i.e. the
mouth with melodious voice.

The point is that for instance 'mur̲uval' does not form one immediate constituent with the adjacent word 'murukkital' but only with 'vāy' similarly 'pavaḷam' not with "ta aṅku" but with 'vāy'. There are also other places like this.[2]

9.4.4. *Ambiguous interpretation*

There are other places where the attributes in succession directly describe the head. Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar takes the first of them as forming a constituent with one word, whilst others are taken to form a constituent with another word. This is rather curious because the attribute cannot jump over certain words like the verbal participle 'parappi' in Tamil to form such a constituent.

"Eḷāat-tōḷ	imil	muḷakkin̲
Māa-t-tāḷ	uyar	maruppin̲
Kaṭuñcin̲atta	kaḷir̲u	parappi
Virikaṭal	viyan̲	tān̲aiyoṭu."[3]

Here the fighting quality of the elephant is described.

1. The elephant with a trunk that knows no defeat.
2. The elephant shouting like thunder.
3. The elephant with feet that crush that heads of the enemies.
4. The elephant with tusks that attack the gates of fortresses.
5. The elephant with great fury.

1. Jīvaka; v. 3088
2. Jīvaka; v. 2918., Porunar; 11. 14-15.
3. Maturai; 11. 177-180.

But Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar interprets the first attribute, as occuring for the last thing i.e. 'the army of soliders'. Eḷattōḷ tān̲ai—He says that it means the soldiers with shoulders that know no defeat. It is not clear why Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar does not want this attribute to go to the elephant. In fact, elsewhere he himself admits the great fighting quality of the elephant.[1]

The real difficulty is that there is no literary usage justifying the use of the word tol in the sense of the trunk of the elephant though a connected word 'kai' or hand is usually found in that sense. This should not however lead us to invent a construction unknown to Tamil where an attribute of a noun like 'tān̲ai', is made to go before a conjunctive participle like 'parappi'; and where the place of that attribute itself seems to suggest a pattern. A commentator in fairness states that the phrase is inexplicable or suggest an emendation 'eḷākkōḷ' might have been the original reading for 'ta' and 'ka' were liable to be compounded in manuscript writing, 'elakkōḷ' will mean with a conviction of conscience or determination not withdrawn. But in fairness to Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar it must be said that he had no such reading available.

9.4.5. *The attribute of the part as the attribute of the whole*

Sometimes an attribute occuring with the whole is interpreted as applicable to the part not mentioned and Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar explains such occurrences.

'Paiṅkoṭi' (green creeper)[2]

as 'the creeper with green leaves'. The attribute 'Pai' (green) does not go to the creeper occuring as such, but to the 'leaf' not described but understood. The attribute of the leaf (part) stands for the creeper (whole) according to Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar. This need not be taken as any variety of construction but as an instance of the application of the attribute of the part of the whole itself because as already explained under the varieties of subjects and predicates the quality and action of the part can be transferred to the whole. Even otherwise this will be a case of transferred epithet in rhetoric.

9.4.6. *An idiom (a) attribute with a latent and not patent significance*

There is also another subtle point described by Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar with reference to the attributes qualifying nouns. The mouths of beautiful women are described.

1. Jīvaka; v. 806.
2. Muruku; l. 190.

"In̲ kan̲i-t-toṇṭaiyan tuvar vāy"[1]

The mouth as beautiful as 'Kovvai fruit'. Here the word kan̲i (fruit) preceding another word 'toṇṭai' meaning itself a fruit is not understandable. So Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar says that 'kan̲i' (fruit) is not an attribute for the part "fruit" but a natural attribute for the whole; the toṇṭai creeper. "in kan̲i-toṇṭai" occuring as it were on its name where 'toṇṭai' need not mean any particular fruit it has, but only refers to the general character of this creeper being capable of bearing fruits. It means "the kovvai creeper with fruits". So there are three stages.

1. the kovvai creeper with the inherent nature of bearing fruits-kan̲i-t-toṇṭai.
2. 'kovvai creeper' here stands for fruits.
3. kovvai fruit like mouth.
   toṇṭai vāy (toṇṭai here the constituent i.e. fruit).

9.4.7. *The attributes merely suggestive of the pun*

'cīr taṅku cempor̲ koṭi
Mallikai mālai cērnṭu"[2]

Here cempor̲koṭi (golden creeper) is a translation of the proper name Kan̲aka patākai and Mālai is another proper noun. Both are names of women who go together.

This suggests a sleṣa alaṅkāra or an interesting punning when apart from the coupling of the names, there can be an implied simile itself. 'Cīrtaṅku', ("in whom resides unique greatness") is applicable to both the person who bears the name Kan̲akapàtākai and golden creeper to whom she can be compared. It is not something natural to the creeper. Mallikai which occurs as the epithet for Mālai is applicable both to the proper name and the garland, the other meaning in the pun. Therefore the commentator states it is appropriate to the meaning garland. It may be that the woman with the name Mālai was adorned with mallikai as Dr. Swaminatha Iyer points out in the footnote of the verse, or that she was not. That is not important.

9.4.8 *Idiom (b) Attribute and Head as a common noun*

There are places where the attributes—occuring as such have no special significance.

1. Jīvaka; v. 2107.
2. Jīvaka; v. 881.

"Naṟu meṉ kamaḻ tār".[1]

The garland with great fragrance. 'Naṟum' means 'fragrance' and 'kamaḻ' also means the same thing. To employ two attributes seems to be unnecessary. Nacciṉārkkiniyar says that 'kamal tār' occurs as a common noun for the garland where therefore kamal + tār should not be separated and interrupted. To this inseparable unit the attribute 'naṟum' is added.

9.4.9. *Relative Participle+Noun as Attribute and Head*

There might be some confusion regarding the relative participle constructions. 'Naṭanta Cātta ṉ'—(Cattaṉ who walked). Here there is no confusion. Tolkāppiyar mentions eight kinds of relative participle constructions.[2] The commentators explain them still further and mention, wherever necessary, kind of relative participle construction, as mentioned by Tolkāppiyar. Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar, wherever there is a confusion, instead of affecting to be very grammatical, quoting Tolkāppiyam for this purpose, usually points out similar usages of relative participles and compares them. It is clear he considers that usage gains precedence over grammar.

9.4.10 *Cause and effect construction*

The poet describes the desert as 'a dry expanse with fire eaten coal'. 'Venta kari' means 'the fire eaten charcoal.[3] Here it is not like 'uṇṭa Cāttaṉ' (Cāttaṉ who ate)—where 'uṇṭa' is the action of Cāttaṉ. Here 'Venta' (meaning 'fire-eaten', according to Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar) is not the action of the coal but of the fire. He says it is like the well-known phrase 'uṇṭa eccil' (eaten left-overs). Here, the 'eccil' is formed because of eating. 'Eating' is the cause and the 'eccil' is the result. In the same way, because of fire the coal was formed. The fire that ate (spread) is the cause and the charcoal is its effect. Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar says this type of participle construction comes under Tolkāppiyar's classification of 'karuvi'. He makes this distinction at other places also.[4]

There is another description of the desert in Ciṟupāṇāṟṟuppaṭai.

'Pālai niṉṟa pālai neṭu vaḻi'[5]

1. Jīvaka; v. 1516.
2. Tol. Col; s. 236.
3. Kali; v. 13:2.
4. Kali; v. 90:23. Jīvaka; v. 332.
5. Ciṟupāṇ; l. 11.

It means—"the desert way with the qualities of a desert"—Here the desert quality is the cause and the desert is the effect. Naccinārkkiniyar does not quote 'uṇṭa eccil' to explain this, but says it is like 'āṟu ceṉṟa viyar'. (Way crossed sweet; the sweet caused by crossing the distance).[1] Cēṉāvaraiyar says it (sweet) is the object (ceyappaṭuporuḷ).[2] Anyhow it is clear that both the constructions 'venta kari' and uṇṭa eccil, though they belong to the same cause and effect construction, are different from each other, as Naccinārkkiniyar explains them quoting different usages. In the first case, the action of the fire operates on the other to effect the change of turning the wood into charcoal, whereas in āṟu ceṉṟa viyar, the action of the man viz., going, causes perspiration in himself. So the innate quality of pālai causes the manifestation of the outward signs of a desert.

9.4.11. *Effect and cause construction*

The war camp is described in Pattuppāṭṭu "aracu iruntu paṉikkum...pācaṟai.[3] The war camp that causes the trembling of the foes. Paṉittal-trembling. Naccinārkkiniyar says it is like "nōy tīru maruntu",[4] 'The disease curing medicines'. The cure of the disease is the effect and the medicine is the cause. So also trembling of the foes is effect and war camp is the cause. Naccinārkkiniyar therefore holds that "paṉikkum pācarai" is like 'nōy tīru maruntu'. Cēṉāvaraiyar classifies this under 'karuvi'.[5]

9.5. *Concordance or Agreement*

9.5.1. *Tiṇai, pāl, eṇ, iṭam*

Words in Tamil are divided into superior category words (or human) and non-superior category words (or inferior category words or non-human). This distinction is called 'tiṇai'. The superior category may be singular or plural. The singular under the superior category is either masculine or feminine. No such distinction is made grammatically in the plural of the superior. The non-superior category is divided into the singular and the plural. Here there is no distinction of gender in this category. This distinction into the masculine and feminine, epicene, neuter singular and neuter plural are called the five-fold 'pāl' distinction. All these in a sense relate to the third person though according to Tolkāppiyam the first person

1. Tol. Col; s. 236. p. 263.
2. Tol. Col. Cēṉā; s. 234.
3. Mullai; 1. 79.
4. Kali; v. 60: 18.
5. Tol. Col. Cēṉā; s. 234.

belongs to the superior category.[1] In addition we have the first person and second person words. Each one of these is subdivided into the singular and the plural. The person is known in Tamil as 'iṭam' and the grammatical number is called 'eṇ'.

9.5.2. *Vaḻānilai, vaḻu, vaḻuvamaiti*

In the Tamil subject predicate construction, the subject and predicate must agree in respect of tiṇai, pāl, eṇ, and iṭam. The Tamil grammarians have recognised certain idiomatic usages where there is no such agreement. Agreement in all respects is called 'vaḻā nilai' (the grammatical usage), violation of grammatical usage (Vaḻu) and vaḻuvamaiti is idiomatic usage.[2]

Avaṉ vantāṉ—vaḻā nilai.

Avaṉ vantāḷ—vaḻu.

Cāttaṉum pacuvum vantār—vaḻuvamaiti.

In English it is so in respect of number mainly. "A singular nominative expression is joined only with a singular finite verb expression and a plural nominative expression only with a plural finite verb expression.[3] In Tamil as the subject often shows tiṇai etc., the reference to tiṇai etc., in the predicate is more a cross reference rather than concord.

9.5.3. *Akṟiṇai viravuppeyar*

The general rule that the singular noun should have singular predicate and the plural, plural predicate is there in Tamil, but with reference to akṟiṇai nouns (inferior category), there is no cross reference in a majority of cases. Its number is to be known only through the predicates.

1. Maram valarntatu — tree grows — singular.
2. Maram valarntaṉa — tree(s) grow — plural.

Tolkāppiyar calls this noun "akṟiṇai iyaṟpeyar" (a noun common to both singular and plural in akṟiṇai).[4]

9.5.4. *Cāti orumai (species—singular)*

Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar introduces another distinction cāti orumai and cāti-p-paṉmai which is known to other commentators all over India.

1. Tol. Col; s. 164, 204, 205.
2. Tol. Col. Cēṉā; s. 11
3. Language; p. 190.
4. Tol. Col. s. 171.

"Pollāmai itu"[1]

Here 'pollāmai' refers to all the bad things, but the predicate is 'itu' (this) which is singular. As the word 'pollāmai' is singular, though it might be referring to many things, the singular predicate is employed. 'Pollāmai' is cāti orumai according to Naccinārkkiniyar. 'Pollāmai' is an abstract noun, but in this context it refers to concrete acts but all taken as coming under one head or class. Cāti orumai is something common to all belonging to a particular class name in singular. Similarly he mentions 'pōkam' as a class name referring to all the various pleasures of life.[2] The transitoriness of wealth and body is referred to in the singular form elsewhere also,[3] because transitoriness as a class is singular. All these are referred to as cāti orumai by Naccinārkkiniyar.

9.5.5. *Cati-p-panmai (more than one species)*

It has been said that an akriṇai noun is generally common to both singular and plural. But when it takes the suffix 'kaḷ', it denotes the plural. Apart from the predicate and the 'kaḷ' suffix there may be lexical ways as different from grammatical means to show the number. When the class name is mentioned it may refer to the common class name for the whole genus or it may refer to the species. There may be cāti orumai when only one species is intended and cāti -p-panmai then all the species i.e. more than one species are intended. This is a logical distinction; akriṇai iyarpeyar is a grammatical conception where in Tamil the akriṇai nouns stand for both the singular and plural.

'People' refers to the citizens of a country, and peoples refers to the populations of different countries.

Arici nanru — the rice is good — cāti orumai.
Aricikaḷ nallana — the rices are good — cāti-p-panmai

The 'arici' refers to a particular variety of rice, but 'aricikaḷ', the different varieties of the same.[4]

In Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi when the poet says "peṇkaḷ" (women) Naccinārkkiniyar takes it as cāti-p-panmai.[5] If the word 'peṇ' has

1. Jīvaka; v. 717.
2. Jīvaka; v. 206.
3. Jīvaka; v. 213.
4. An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics; pp. 145-146.
5. Jīvaka; v. 901.

occurred it might refer to women only, but the addition of 'kaḷ' (plural suffix) refers to the different kinds of women.

Sometimes even without the addition of the plural suffix, the cāti orumai (species-singular) will refer to the cāti-p-paṉmai (species-plural).

"Pal uṇavu".[1]

Here instead of 'kaḷ' (plural suffix), the plural attribute 'pal' is added, and it means varieties of dishes and so this uṇavu is referred to as cāti-p-paṉmai as it has to be interpreted as a plural because of 'pal'.

This classification of cāti-orumai and cāti-p-paṉmai is similar to the mass noun singular and plural in English. "The singular of a mass noun, in the simplest case, refers to some quantity, usually undefined and frequently not countable, of some substance. The plural of a mass noun usually refers to a number of kinds or species of the substance e.g. beauties of poetry".[2]

9.5.6. *Cross reference-number*

In poetry sometimes it is likely that there is disagreement in number in respect of the subject and predicate. Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar, at such places, with his great skill as a literary critic, is able to bring about the correct cross reference. Jīvakaṉ meets Nantaṭṭaṉ after a long time and he becomes sentimental and therefore eloquent over the values of brotherhood.

"Oṇ poruḷ āvatu aiyā uṭaṉ piṟappu ākkalākā"[3]

Here uṭaṉ piṟappu (co-birth) i.e. being brothers and sisters. It is an abstract noun though in form a verbal noun. It is here in the singular because it refers as a concrete word to the only brother who is addressed in this speech. 'Ākkalākā' (not to be made) is a plural predicate. Here there is disagreement in number in respect of subject and predicate. Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar instead of considering ākkalākā as a predicate of uṭaṉpiṟappu, makes it an attribute of oṇporuḷ (precious thing).

'ākkalākā oṇporuḷ uṭaṉ piṟappu'

---

1. Perumpāṇ; l. 246.
2. An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics; pp. 145-146.
3. Jīvaka; v. 1760.

"that which cannot be made precious thing co-birth". 'ākā' can be either a finite verb or an infinite verb in the sense of relative participle giving negative meaning. Naccinārkkiniyar considers it as the latter one, and reconciles the disagreement in number. But it is doubtful whether the peyar eccam (relative participle) can ever come after its own head. It is possible to interpret uṭan pirappu as cāti-p-panmai as referring to worthy brothers, worthless brothers and so on. The implication is that "even a worthless brother cannot be made to order." "If so how impossible the attainment of a worthy brother like you".

9.5.7. *Cross reference (Tiṇai and number)*

The subject and predicate should agree with each other in respect of tiṇai, pāl, eṇ and iṭam, as we saw earlier. There are places in literature where they do not agree and Naccinārkkiniyar, by his magic touch, relieves such passages of such seeming lapses.

Jīvakan renounces the world. The poet describes it as under.

Nāma vēl narapati nīkki nankalam
Tāmamār mālaiyum turakkinrānarō
Kāmanār kalaṅ kaḻikkinra tottatē.[1]

Jīvakan renounces jewels and garlands. It is like Manmata relieving himself of the jewels. Here it occurs like this:

'Turakkinrān ottatu'.

The subject and predicate do not agree with each other in respect of tiṇai and pāl. The comparison and the thing compared also do not agree.

Turakkinrān — upamēyam — uyartiṇai masculine.
Kaḻikkinratu — upamānam — akriṇai singular.

Here the thing compared is Jīvakan and the word referring to him i.e. turakkinrān is a noun (superior category). The comparison is a word i.e. Kaḻikkinratu referring to the action and it belongs to akriṇai (inferior category). So the simile looks absurd. The comparison between Jīvakan and Manmatan is appropriate. So Naccinārkkiniyar says that turakkinrān refers only to the way Jīvakan renounces (i.e. turakkinramai) the jewels and garlands, which is like the way Manmata relieves himself of the jewels. This actually

1. Jīvaka; v. 3027.

saves the passage from a grammatical lapse and the poet owes it to the critic. But 'atu' is a demonstrative pronoun like 'that' and this (atu) can be understood after tuṟakkiṉṟāṉ.

9.5.8. *Cross reference tiṇai, number-ambiguous*

There are places where even Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar feels helpless to effect reconciliation. Tolkāppiyar himself has mentioned some of the sanctions for such violation and Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar simply refers to them.

Tollai nālvakai-t-tōḻarum tūmaṇi neṭuntēr
Mallal tampiyum māmaṉum matuviri kamaḻtār
Celvaṉ tātaiyum ceḻu nakaroṭu vaḷa nāṭum
Vallaī-t-tokkatu vaḷaṅkeḻu kōyiluḷ oruṅkē.[1]

Here it occurs as:

Tōlarum, tampium, māmaṉum
ūrum, nāṭum tokkatu

It means: 'friends, brother, uncle, father, the town and the country all collected together'. Here friends, brother, uncle and father belong to uyartiṇai (superior category) and the town and the country akṟiṇai (inferior category). The superior and inferior categories coming together become the subject and have the predicate of the inferior category (tokkatu-assembled).

Tolkāppiyar has mentioned that if the superior and inferior categories come together they have to have a predicate and as it can be only either the predicate of the 'superior' or the predicate of the inferior, it is better to employ the predicate of the inferior category.[2] Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar refers to the sanction of Tolkāppiyam in the passage quoted above.

But there is another disagreement here and Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar has not quoted any sanction. That is, the superior and inferior both have the singular predicate (tokkatu-assembled) of the inferior category, where the things mentioned are many. Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar simply says that it is 'orumai paṉmai mayakkam' (singular plural confusion). Probably the singular is used to denote the action of all these occuring automatically overpowered by the greatness of Jīvakaṉ as though all these were only one thing.

---

1. Jīvaka; v. 2360.
2. Tol. Col; s. 51.

9.6. *Change of order of words in poetry*

Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar is often blamed by the scholars for his wrenching away words and phrases from the places of their occurrence to distant places in the same verse or other. There are many reasons for his peculiar method of syntax as understood from his commentary as we have noted already. In prose the traditional and natural order of words is the following:

Subject + object + predicate.

9.6.1. *Ordinary and literary usages*

In poetry, restriction in the order is impossible, as it has to conform to the system of sound and metre as well as to syntax. Tolkāppiyar mentions places where the syntax of poetry does not agree with ordinary usage in prose and this he does with a thorough understanding of the morphology and syntax of the Tamil Language. Some of them are the following:

		Ordinary usage		*Literary usage*
Form.	1.	avviru	—	āyiru[1]
	2.	pala cila	—	palāañcilāam.[2]
	3.	vēṭkai avā.	—	vēṇavā.[3]
	4.	poṟ paṭai.	—	polampaṭai.[4]

		Ordinary usage		*Literary usage*
order.	1.	Centāmarai (as against veṇṭāmarai)	—	Ceññāyiṟu (where there is no veṇ ñāyiṟu).[5]
	2.	Payir nalla āyiṉa	—	maḻai peytamaiyāl payir nalla āyiṉa.[6]
	3.	ceṅkāl nārai	—	kāl cen nārai.[7]
	4.	demonstrative succeeds a noun	—	demonstrative precedes a noun.[8]

1. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 208.
2. Ibid; s. 213.
3. Ibid; s. 288.
4. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 356.
5. Tol. Col; s. 18.
6. Ibid; ss. 21, 22.
7. Tol. Col; s. 26.
8. Ibid; ss. 38, 39.

5.	'therefore' succeeds the basis statement	— 'therefore' precedes also.[1]
6.	The superior and inferior categories take the predicate of the inferior category.	— they may take a predicate of the superior category.[2]

9.6.2. *Classification of syntax in poetry*

Tolkāppiyar has classified the syntax of poetry under four heads and calls them "moḷi puṇar iyalpu".[3]

1. Niral niṟai
2. Cuṇṇam
3. Aṭimaṟi
4. Moḷimāṟṟu.

He has fairly systemised the first three and those he could not bring under them, has brought under 'moḷimāṟṟu'

9.6.3. *Āṟṟoḷukku (the natural order)*

The author of Naṉṉūl has mentioned many more forms of syntax and what he could not classify, he too has brought them under 'koṇṭu kūṭṭu'.[4] The first among his classes is āṟṟoḷukku', "the most natural order of words which clearly brings out the meaning". Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar, in many places, follows this natural order of syntax, known as āṟṟoḷukku.'[5] Sometimes he has to dislodge the words and phrases in verses mainly to arrange them in accordance with the traditional natural order. This proper arrangement for clarity is known as 'anvayam' (prose order).

Inversion in poetry	*Naccinārkkiṉiyar's arrangement*
1. ārtta vaḷai, kaṭukiṉa ivuḷi P S P S	— Vaḷai ārtta, ivuḷi kaṭukiṉa.[6]
2. kāvalaṉ ēttiṉāṉ mātavar pātam S P O	—kāvalaṉ mātavar pātam ēttiṉāṉ.[7] S O P

1. Tol. Col.; s. 40.
2. Ibid; s. 51.
3. Tol. Col; ss. 404-409.
4. Naṉṉūl; s. 411.
5. Jīvaka; vv. 2528, 2581, 2619, 2620, 2641, 2856, etc. Kali; vv. 135: 6—8, 135: 9-11; 115:7. etc.
6. Jīvaka; v. 1850.
7. Ibid; v. 2892.

3. Palavuṭaṉ vinai peruti nī muṉṉiya — nī muṉṉiya viṉai peruti.[1]

viṉai	P	S	O	S	O	P

(S: Subject. P: Predicate. O: Object)

9.6.4. *Niralniṟai*

Niralniṟai is another kind of syntax in verse where the subjects are mentioned seriatim and then their corresponding predicates are also thus listed.[2] The intention is that the words in the one group and the words in the second should be taken together respectively in the order mentioned. In many places the commentator engages himself in putting the subjects and predicates together and later explains the meaning. But in some places there is chiasmus where the words in the first group and those in the second should be taken in the reverse order. For instance:

"Naṉ māṇikkam naku tāli
Pēṇi nallār kaḻuttaṇintu"[3]

Here the action of the women putting on the jewels is described. There are two subjects, 'māṇikkam' and 'tāli' and normally in the order of predicates that occur, it should be 'māṇikkam pēṇi' and 'tāli aṇintu' i.e. protect the emerald by keeping it in its place and putting on the 'tāli' (the sacred thread indicating the married state). Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar finds a natural difficulty in explaining this as such. Tāli is a thing that is worn by women all the time and it cannot be removed at one's will. So to say that 'tāli is put on' looks absurd. He therefore sees a chiasmus and interprets that 'māṇikkam aṇintu' and 'tāli peṉi'.

Subject	*Predicate*
Māṇikkam	aṇintu
Tāli	pēṇi.

The tāli is protected by being kept in its place and the emerald is put on. This type of syntax is called by grammarians as 'mayakka niralniṟai' i.e. chiasmus.[4]

9.6.5. *Moḻimāṟṟu and māṭṭu*

There are other kinds of syntax mentioned by Tolkāppiyar and we have discussed them earlier.[5] Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar follows the

1. Muruku: 11. 64-66.
2. Tol. Col; s. 405.
3. Jīvaka; v, 2697.
4. Tol. Col; s. 405, p. 383.
5. Supra; 9.1.6 to 9.1.9. pp. 270-271.

second type of syntax 'māṭṭu' for the proper arrangement of attributes and their heads. For instance: The poet describes the groves in Pukār city. 'Tāḻ kā' refers to the grove and occurs in line 53 in Paṭṭiṉa-p-pālai. What happened therein is described in lines 53 to 58. Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar takes the verbs in these lines as adjectives qualifying the noun 'tāḻkā' or grove. Ordinarily the description precedes and does not follow the noun it qualifies. The verse describes the various beauty spots in Pukār and therefore all the nouns like grove have to be added on to the word 'Paṭṭiṉam'. Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar therefore exploits 'māṭṭu' to his advantage and brings all the descriptions together in lines 53-58 to qualify the noun 'tāḻkā' in line 53. Thus he also takes all the nouns in various places in the poem as adjectives to qualify 'Paṭṭiṉam' the head word occurring at the end.

9.6.6. *Displacement of the order*

"To emphasise the topic".

(1) *For emphasis* : There are places where Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar voluntarily violates the order. Vilāci and Alaṅkāramālai, two maids, dress up their heroine Ilakkaṇai. Here in the verse, Ilakkaṇai, the object, occurs in the middle and the subjects Vilāci and Alaṅkāramālai initially and the predicate 'dress up' at the last.[1] But Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar changes the natural order while explaining thus:

Naṅkaiyai-t-tōḻiyar alaṅkarittaṉar.

O S P

The reason for this change is interesting to investigate. Here Ilakkaṇai is being dressed up by the maids. The syntax is changed for a specific purpose. Here the maids are not so important as Ilakkaṇai, the heroine, who is the main character there. The object Ilakkaṇai is therefore more important than the subject, the maids. This is the reason why he changes the order of words and this achieves a literary quality. This change of Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar indicates that if the object is more important than the subject it can precede the subject. According to him 'naṅkaiyai' is the topic and 'tōḻiyar alaṅkarittaṉar' forms the remark about the topic.

(2) *To emphasise the logical order-cause and effect*

In Tamil the cause is usually mentioned earlier and the effect later. Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar, wherever this order is violated in poetry, puts-them back in the natural order and explains the passage. For

1. Jīvaka; v. 2435.

example Kāri, a kind of bird, hovers around the cows and this is an ill-omen. The cowherds, seeing this, give warning to their kinsmen. They ask them to protect the cows:

"Kāṉiṭai iṉa nirai kāval pōṟṟumiṉ
Āṉiṭai aḻitta puḷ eṉṟu kūṟiṉār"[1]

Here the order of cause and effect is changed. 'Protect the cows in the forest' — this is effect. The cause is the hovering around of kāri. Naccinārkkiṉiyar changes this to clarify the natural logical sequence: the cause and effect - order.

1. the hovering of kāri — cause.
2. protecting the cows — effect.

But in some places and certainly here it is evident that the effect is more important than the cause. Here the mention of ill-omen is not as important as what one has to do to avert what is portended by the ill-omen. Naccinārkkiṉiyar's conventional method of interpretation appears to be prosaic in this instance, when we compare this with his interpretation elsewhere.

(3) *To avoid irrelevance of similes*

If the words are interpreted in the order of their occurrence, sometimes the comparison and the thing compared in a simile may not agree with each other. In such places Naccinārkkiṉiyar changes the order and explains the meaning. Toṇṭaimāṉ Iḷantiraiyaṉ entertains the musicians and gives away golden flowers for their women. It is described as under:—

"Mīṉ pūttaṉṉa vāṉ kalam parappi
Maka muṟai maka muṟai nōkki mukaṉ amarntu
Āṉā viruppiṉ tāṉ niṉṟu ūṭṭi".

"Maṅkul vāṉattu-t-tiṅkaḷ ēykkum
Āṭu vaṇtimirā aḻal avir tāmarai
Nīṭirum pittai poliya-c-cūṭṭi".[2]

Two things are described here.

1. The musicians are served food on silver plates.
2. The golden lotuses are put on their tresses of hair.

Like the stars in the sky the silver plates are spread. The golden lotuses are compared to the moon, if interpreted in the order the

1. Jīvaka; v. 1849.
2. Perumpāṇ; 11. 477-482.

words occur. But Naccinārkkiniyar does not interpret the lines in this way. He changes the order of words and says that the silver plates are like the moon and his order is this,

Mankul vānattu
Mīn pūttanna vānkalam
Tinkaḷ ēykkum vānkalam

According to him the small silver plates are like the stars and the big ones are like the moon. He feels that the fancy gold lotuses, which he thinks must be red, cannot be compared to the moon which he thinks must be white. The gold is also yellow and the moon rising from the sea is not white. The golden lotus in the dark tresses are appropriately compared to the rising moon amidst clouds. Therefore he changes the order as shown above. But in all these cases, the question is whether even poetic exigencies will allow such alternations, can 'tinkaḷ ēykkum', if a peyar eccam (relative participle) take a leap to the front.

(4) *To conform to history*

Pattupāṭṭu, besides being literature, is a source of history. Karikālan, Neṭuñceḷiyan, Iḷantiraiyan Nalliyakkōṭan Nannan, etc. are some of the kings mentioned in this work. Some of the references to their activities and history are found in Puranānūru also. The similarity of ideas in all these works, to some extent, show their authenticity. So Naccinārkkiniyar wherever he finds that there might be historical contradictions in the narrative if a passage is interpreted in the order of words as occuring in poetry as such, changes them to conform to the historical facts known to him.

"Pirantu tavaḷ karratarroṭṭu-c-ciranta nan
Nāṭu cekir koṇṭu nāṭorum vaḷarppa"[1]

Here the story of Karikālan is narrated. If interpreted as it stands it means that Karikālan was shouldering the responsibility of protecting the interests of his country, ever since he was born and learnt to crawl. But this is wrong from the current traditional history. Karikālan did not rule the country from his childhood as he had a difficult and trying formative period when he was a boy. He was imprisoned by his enemies and he escaped from prison, defeated them all and secured his kingdom.[2] But the direct meaning of these lines is

1. Porunar; ll. 137-138.
2. Paṭṭinam; ll. 220-227.

in contradiction with those historical facts known to the commentator. So he says that since he was born and brought up, he was increasing in valour and strength.

Tavaḷ kaṟṟataṟṟoṭṭu (Por. 1. 137)
Miḷi moympiṉ miku vali cerukki (Por. 1. 140)

Here Naccinārkkiṉiyar's syntax relieves the poem from the contradiction to history.

But unless one is sure of the history one should not take liberties with the natural order found in the poem. There is a view as we have mentioned in the first chapter, that Tirumāvaḷavaṉ of Paṭṭiṉappālai is different from the Karikālaṉ of Porunarāṟṟuppaṭai, again there are scholars who hold that there were more than one Karikālaṉ.[1] But Naccinārkkiniyar's position is clear. It is one of the canons of criticism that a poem has to be interpreted so as to fit with the facts known about the period of history when it was written.

1. Karikālar mūvar; pp. 77-81.

CHAPTER - 10

SEMANTIC CHANGES

10. 1. *Words and their meanings*

10.1.1. *All words have meanings*

Semantics is the branch of linguistics that deals with the meanings of words. In Tolkāppiyam we find that the grammar of words and their meanings are discussed together. According to our grammarians, all words have meanings. Even the acainilai, expletive or pseud words, if one may use that term, are linked to full words as they are and in that way significant; in that they are restricted in their use, sometimes with reference to the person etc. the icainirai (expletive used to fill a gap in the metre) by completing the melody of words in poems, refer to their meanings because rhythm is one of the important aspects of the meaning of poetry suggested by symbolism of sound and meaning. Turning to phrases like 'muyaṟkōṭu' (hare's horn), though such objects do not exist, they occur as the subjects of 'illai' ('do not exist') and therefore they refer to imaginary things. Reference to an imaginary thing is also a meaning, according to Naccinārkkiniyar.[1]

10.1.2. *The way in which words convey their meanings*

As we study the way in which words convey their meanings, we understand two things classified by Tolkāppiyar: (a) the words refer to their meanings, (b) the words refer to themselves.[2]

10.1.3. *Words referring to their meanings*

1. Cāttan̲ vantān̲ (Cāttan̲ came) — Here the first is a noun and the second, a verb.
2. Paṇṭu kāṭu man̲ (This was indeed a forest in old times) — Here the particle 'man̲' emphasises the past tense.
3. Uṟu kāl (The strong wind) — Here 'uṟu' an uriccol, becomes one with the following noun, kāl, The Tamil

---

1. Tol. Col; s. 157
2. Tol. Col; 158.

grammarians divide the words into these four categories viz., noun, verb, particles or morphemes other than roots and uriccol which is variously interpreted but which according to Teyvaccilaiyār are the root morphemes (similar to Sanskrit 'dātu').[1]

10.1.4. *Words referring to their forms*

The words referring to their forms and not to their respective meanings are :

1. Ceyte<u>n</u> eccam (ceytu form of participle)
2. Tañca-k-kiḷavi (the word tañcam)
3. Ceyke<u>n</u> kiḷavi (Ceyku form of verb)

10.1.5. *Classification of meaning*

The words, we are further told, convey their meanings in two ways and therefore the meaning is divided into two.[2]

1. Explicit meaning of the words.
2. Implicit or suggestive meaning of the words.

According to Pavaṇanti mu<u>n</u>ivar, we must use words in the same way and in the same meanings as sanctioned and used by scholars, and this is called marapu or convention.[3] But this convention itself is changing like every human institution through the passage of time and in the context of changing circumstances. Especially in poetry, the author creates new possibilities for the language. This change is also sanctioned by Tamil grammarians.[4] It is from this point of view that the commentary of Nacci<u>n</u>ārkki<u>n</u>iyar will be studied in this chapter.

10.2. *Changes of meaning*

10-2.1. *The subjective for the objective*

The things can be classified as (1) Subjective and (2) Objective. The subjective things, according to Tolkāppiyar, are not visible to the naked eyes. They can be realised by the mind only,[5] whereas

1. Tol. Col; Teyva; s. 292.
2. Tol. Col; s. 159.
3. Na<u>nn</u>ūl; s. 388.
4. Tol. Col; s. 452; Na<u>nn</u>ūl; s- 462.
5. Tol. Poruḷ. Iḷam; s. 243.

the objective things are seen with the eyes or perceived by direct contact with our physical senses. Sometimes subjective things can have objective references also, as stated in Naccinārkkiniyar's commentary.

'Tuṇi' means 'to determine'. The mind seized with the problem of good and bad, at last takes a decision.[1] As this is the activity and nature of the mind, it is subjective. In literature it is used to refer to an objective state. The turbid water, after some confusion, settles down to a condition of mud at the bottom and clear water on the top. This clear water is called,

'Tuṇi nīr'.[2]

The subjective state of 'Tuṇital' is used to refer to an objective condition of clear water. Naccinārkkiniyar reveals this meaning 'Teḷintanīr' (clear water) by which we are able to arrive at this point of subjective for the objective. 'Tuṇi katir' also means clear light, as interpreted by Naccinārkkiniyar.[3]

But it may be argued that the concrete or the objectve has been applied to the subjective operation. Tuṇi means here (1) clarified stage (2) the mental process also; there are two stages—one, where there is merely an awareness of an object when the person does not know what it really is. This is considered to be the operation of mind (manam), then succeeds what is called determinate knowledge as a result of the operation of reason (buddhi). Here the object is perceived with its special characteristics when there is clear perception of the thing. These two stages might have been named 'Kalakkam' and 'tuṇital', the words once used with reference to muddy water and clear water etc. Then this would be an example for the objective in sight used for the subjective. Therefore it is better to give another an unambiguous, example.

Uḷḷam is something inside—a mind. After it had signified a mind or a heart, it must be taken as referring to something subjective whatever its origin might be. Then this word denoting something subjective suffers another shift where it denotes the middle part of a road as the heart of the road. There is a line in Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi.

'Vīti uḷam kalittu.[4]

It is interpreted by Naccinārkkiniyar as meaning,

1. Kuṟaḷ; v. 467.
2. Maturai; l. 283.
3. Jīvaka; v. 170.
4. Jīvaka; v. 2129.

"going in the middle of the street".

uḷam—middle, and the middle of the street is an objective idea.

10.2.2 *Objective for the subjective*

We understand from Naccinārkkiniyar's commentary that there are places where the objective things refer to the subjective things. If there is a thing which has eluded us for long and at last we are able to get hold of it, it is called 'kaippaṭuttal'. The hero's clandestine activity of visiting other women, one day becomes an open affair, when the heroine sees with her own eyes what he has been covering up so long. The heroine refers to it at that time.

'Kaippaṭuttēṉ'.[1]

Naccinārkkiniyar interprets it as "Now I am convinced in my mind" —'Kaippaṭuttēṉ' an objective word referring to a subjective idea of being convinced. There are also other places where similarly the objective is used for the subjective.

	Objective		*Subjective*
1.	kaṇṭu (seen)	—	vicārittu (mental enquiry)[2]
2.	niṟuttu (weighed)	—	ārāyntu (investigating)[3]
3.	niḻal (shade)	—	aruḷ (grace)[4]
4.	naṭai (walking)	—	muṟai (method)[5]

10.2.3. *Wearing out of a hyperbole*

For the sake of bringing out the great emotion surging within, sometimes exaggerated statements are made. Mere teasing may be spoken of as 'killing'. But it is not literally true. In such cases, the hyperbolic expressions have to be taken as being justified only as an expression of the emotion. They cannot be interpreted literally. Sometimes by constant usage, such words develop the meaning which signifies no exaggeration; e.g. 'kill' comes to have the meaning of teasing alone. From Naccinārkkiniyar's commentary we understand some of the words behave like this.

The similarity between the 'karuṭaṉ' (white headed kite) and peacock is referred to in literature.

---

1. Kali; v. 98:7.
2. Jīvaka; 1824.
3. Kali; v. 31:23.
4. Porunar; 1. 149
5. Jīvaka; v. 399.

Añciṟai-k-kalāpa maññai
aṇaṅkara vaṭṭateṉum
Añciṟai-k-kaluḷanāku
māṭciyoṉ ṟānu miṉṟē[1]

"The peacock is capable of getting hold of a snake and making it feel afraid of it, whereas the karuṭaṉ is able to create terror in the mind of a snake even when the latter thinks of the former. Here there is a word 'aṭṭatu'. The root of this word is 'aṭu' to kill. Here the peacock is not described as having killed the snake but is shown as making the snake feel afraid of it. 'aṭu' is justified because of the emotion engendered in the mind of the snake. It is thus a justified exaggeration for "being afraid".

Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar also quotes in this connection from Tirukkuṟaḷ where there is a reference to killing the feeling of gratitude.[2] Both the killings (in Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi and Tirukkuṟaḷ) are similar according to him. 'Killing' is justified here because its cruelty expresses the feeling of the author. 'kātu' is also a word meaning destruction but by constant use it has come to mean suffering some defects. So also, words like 'ceku'. Here is an example for the former in the text and latter in the commentary. "Uyir cekuttu" (having killed) is a phrase interpreted by Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar as 'having marred the beauty'.[3]

10.2.4. *Its opposite-an euphemism*

There is the opposite case as well illustrated by Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar's commentary. This may be one variety of euphemism. The eyes of women separated from Jīvakaṉ are compared to a pair of fish that run about (in a frightened state in troubled waters). Here the poet says:

"Vāṭ kaṇkaḷ pulampi ōṭiṉa"[4]

'ōṭiṉa' means (the eyes) 'ran', in its normal sense. But Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar interprets it as 'eyes suffer'. He quotes from Ciṟupāṇāṟṟu-p-paṭai:

ōṭiyatu uṇartalum.[5]

1. Jīvaka; v. 1405.
2. Kuṟaḷ; v. 110.
3. Jīvaka; v. 168.
4. Jīvaka; v. 2381.
5. Ciṟupāṇ; l. 214.

Here ōṭiyatu means suffering and this justifies his explanation. There it is said that Nalliyakkōṭaṉ, after realising the sufferings of the musicians gave them shelter and gifts. Here ōṭiyatu (running about or wandering) has occurred in the same sense 'suffering'.

There is another instance in Tirumurukāṟṟuppaṭai with reference to the victory of Lord Muruka:

"Avuṇar nalvalam aṭaṅka-k-kaviḷ inar
Mā mutal taṭinta maruvil koṟṟam"[1]

Here the mango tree is cut in a way that denied the victory to the 'Asuras'. 'Ataṅka' means to shorten. But here it means 'cut out of existence'. Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar quotes an usage like this in Ciṟupañ-camūlam.[2]

Another instance. "Arum paṭar neñcam aḻivoṭu kūmpum".[3]

"My mind, thinking of the hero, has no thought of itself and suffers" Here "arumpaṭar" means, normally, the thought of itself becoming rarer and rarer. 'Rarer means diminishing of thought—but it does not refer to the complete absence of thought. But Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar interprets this as meaning 'complete absence of thought'. So 'arum' a word which normally means 'rare" here means complete absence'. Similar usage is seen in Parimēlaḻakar's commentary where 'arumai' (rare) means iṉmai (complete absence).[4] This is therefore a case of euphemism where complete absence is expressed as a rarity.

Another kind of euphemism in Tamil is known as 'iṭakkraṭakkal', ("use or indirect or round about expressions to avoid indecent language").[5] This can be illustrated by Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar's commentary.

"Nakku nalaṉum iḻantāḷ"[6]

The heroine lost her charm just after the sexual union. The word 'naku' normally means 'to be happy', but it is interpreted by the commentator as meaning 'the sexual union'.

1. Muruku; 11. 59-60
2. Pattuppāṭṭu; p. 42
3. Kali; v. 130:13.
4. Kuṟaḷ, Pari; v. 7
5. Tol. Col. Iḷam; s. 17., Naṉṉūḷ; s. 267.
6. Kali: v. 146:18.

10.2.5. *General for the specific (Restriction or narrowing)*

The general words that cover many actions or things are interpreted as referring to the specific by Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar. Nakkīrar describes the divine radiance of Lord Murukā.

"Ōvaṟa imaikkum cēṇ viḷaṅku avir oḷi"[1]

'Imaikkum oḷi' is interpreted by Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar as meaning of 'divine lustre; that makes one to shut one's eyes. 'Imaittal' according to him means 'closing the eye-lids'. But 'Imaittal' normally means 'the closing and opening of the eye-lids'. The closing and opening of the eye-lids according to the grammarian takes one mātrai time and that process is described as 'imaittal'.[2] But Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar contends it means closing the eye-lids. When we see the sun, we close our eyes automatically, because we cannot stand its powerful glare. So also, the divine radiance of Lord Murukā is so dazzling that we have to close our eye-lids, and Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar's interpretation ascends to poetic heights. The specific part of closing the eyes, in a general process of opening and closing, has been taken by him. He justifies this meaning with reference to "nutalatu imaiyā nāṭṭam"[3] Here 'imaiyā means that which does not close. The third eye on the forehead of Lord Shiva is referred to here. If Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar means that the word which elsewhere means both closing and opening of the eye-lids, signifies only closing here, it may be taken as a case of restriction.

The word 'Pon̲' (general name for metals) refers to the specific metal silver according to Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar in

"Pon̲ paṭalikai"[4]

There is another instance for this in his commentary.

"Poruḷ ceyyumē"[5]

Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar interprets this as "The wealth sought after". 'Ceyyum' is a general form of all actions. But Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar uses it in the specific sense of 'seeking' which is in conformity with

1. Muruku; 1. 3.
2. Tol. Eḻuttu; s. 7.
3. Pattuppāṭṭu; p. 33.
4. Jīvaka; v. 3035.
5. Jīvaka; v. 1922.

Parimēlaḷakar's commentary of "Ceyka Poruḷai" in Tirukkuṟaḷ.[1] Of course it is said that every specific verb includes the common verb. Here 'cey' has the meaning of acquiring wealth.

10.2.6. *Specific for the general (Expansion or widening)*

Naccinārkkiniyar in his commentaries has sometimes interpreted the specific as giving a general meaning.

Kālam (time) a general thing referring to year, month, week and day, all specific things individually. Tattai is thinking to herself when that time of seeing Jīvaka will come.

"Kaṭ paṭu nāḷ eṉṟuṇṭām"[2]

This is the line in the poem. Naccinārkkiniyar says that nāḷ (day) here means 'time' "when will that time of seeing Jīvakaṉ come" is his interpretation. Nāḷ (day-specific) refers to kālam (time in general here.

Nāṭu, normally refers to the Marutam i.e. the agricultural tract only.[3] But it occurs as referring to all the four kinds of tract[4] and this is also a case of using the specific for the general and this usage has almost displaced the older meaning.

Thus the particular verb referring to a particular action undertaken before completing the whole action, is also interpreted as meaning the whole action.

	Specific action	*General*
1.	Muṭi tuḷakkiṉāṉ	— Vaṇaṅkiṉāṉ.[5]
	(moved the head)	— (bowed)
2.	Vēl ceṟittiṭṭāṉ.	— mīṇṭāṉ.[6]
	(put back the javelin in its place.)	— (returned from war)
3.	Kuṭumi koṇṭāṉ	— Veṟṟi koṇṭāṉ[7]
	(captured the crowns)	— (achieved victory)

1. Kuṟaḷ ; v. 759.
2. Jīvaka; v. 1159.
3. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 2, p. 7. "Kāṭum malaiyum nāṭum Kataṟkaraiyum." Here 'nāṭu' means 'agricultural tract'.
4. Jīvaka; v. 1741.
   Malai; 1.68.
5. Jīvaka; v. 2357.
6. Jīvaka; v. 2250.
7. Ibid; v. 2249.

Here, before bowing, one has to move his head, bend it, and raise the hands together—but the preliminary action of moving the head itself refers to bowing. Similarly the next two refer to returning from war and achieving victory respectively in the same fashion.

10.2.7. *The whole for the part*

Sometimes a word does not refer to the whole idea it is intended to convey, but a part of the meaning only.

When Jīvakaṉ embraces Ilakkaṇai, the anklets make sound.

Aṉṟē..........pūcal iṭṭaṉa.[1]

Here 'aṉṟē' means that day. But here the moment of time when Jīvakaṉ is communing with Ilakkaṇai is referred to. So Naccinārkkiniyar interprets this as meaning 'at that particular part of the day'. Though 'aṉṟē' means the whole day, a part of the day 'that time' is being referred to here.

10.2.8. *The part for the whole*

A word that normally has reference only to the part of a thing sometimes denotes the whole.

Cēṉai-k-kaṭaliṭai-c-celvaṉai-k-kaṇṭuvantu
Ēṉaiyāvarum eṭutturaikkiṉṟār.[2]

The people when they see Jīvakaṉ amidst the sea of people praise him. Here the word that occurs 'ēṉaiyāvarum' means normally 'others also'. But Naccinārkkiṉiyar interprets as 'all'. The part here refers to the whole.

10.2.9. *Activity attributed to inactive things*

One may turn to certain figures of speech which had become more or less a literary convention even in the age af Tolkāppiyar which may be brought under implied anthromorphic metaphors, personifications, transferred epithets, upacara or samadhi. All these are explained here with reference to the verb. Tolkāppiyar has referred to this in his treatise on grammar.

"uṇṭar kuṟiya-v-allāpporuḷai
uṇṭaṉa pōla-k-kūṟalum marapē"[3]

1. Jīvaka: v. 2482.
2. Jīvaka : v. 2120.
3. Tol. Poruḷ. s. 213.

'The thing that cannot eat is shown as eating and this is a literary tradition'. Naccinārkkiniyar, bearing in mind this convention, has brought out such places in the literary works in conformity with grammar.

For example:

"Taṅkoḷi nittila-t-tāmam cūṭiya
Veṅkaḷi iḷamulai"[1]

Here the breasts of women are described. The breasts are shown as wearing the pearl-necklace. The breasts cannot wear of their own accord. It is the women who put on the necklace on the breasts. In this connection Naccinārkkiniyar reminds the readers of this convention and gives another illustration, which was in vogue perhaps during his period (Mulai muṭi cūṭiṟṟu-'the breasts wore the crown') to prove his point. There are other instances where Naccinārkkiniyar describes this literary convention.

1. The Royal Fans move.[2]
2. The waist kissed by Mēkalai.[3]
3. The monastery that wears the mountain.[4]
4. The two hills went.[5]
5. The sleeping tree.[6]

Tolkāppiyar has mentioned another literary convention.

'Vārā marapiṉa vara-k-kūṟutal'[7]

It means that the things that are static are said to move. The illustrations 3 and 4 above may also be classified under this convention.

10.2.10. *An activity not its own attributed to a thing*

This is different from the previous case where what cannot act is described as acting; here an action which is not natural to a thing is attributed to it.

---

1. Jīvaka; v. 94
2. Ibid; v. 2521
3. Ibid; v. 2312.
4. Jīvaka; v. 1786.
5. Ibid; v. 1181.
6. Malai; l. 261.
7. Tol. Col; s. 422.

"Kalvi cēr māntarin̲ ir̲aiñci-k-kāyttavē".[1]

Here the growth of the paddy crops is described. Ner̲payir kāyttan̲a'—kāyttan̲a means 'bore fruit', whereas the paddy crops are usually spoken of as 'viḷaintan̲a' (produced). So it is obvious here, the poet has used a verb denoting an action different from that which belongs to the paddy crops. Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar gives an illustration for this: "tār̲u paṭu nel"—The paddy that has a cluster of fruits. Tāru is a cluster of banana fruits and it is not used for paddy. 'Nel katir' is the usual phrase. Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar refers to such instances in literature.

1. The ghee was so melted that the fire ate it.[2]
2. The flag that licks the sky.[3]
3. The fruit delivered by the neruñci.[4]
4. The lightning that bathed in the cloud.[5]

10.2.11. *Another variety of this attribution*

There is another variety of attribution where the action is attributed not to the subject, but to the object in a sentence. For instance:

"Varai uṭutta paḷḷiyiṭam"[6]

It means the monastery that wore the mountain. But the mountain is never worn as a cloth. From the point of the monastery it was explained that wearing a cloth of mountain is attributed to it; but here the other point emphasised is that the mountain is never worn, whereas in figurative usage it is spoken of as being so worn.

We saw earlier attribution of the different action of a thing as against its own native action and that was explained with reference to subject, but here we shall see the same is done with reference to object. For example:

"Nayan̲illān vin̲ai vāṅka".[7]

It means—'the minister brought out the action from his mind'. The word 'vāṅka' is a verb meaning to bring out or to draw out. The

1. Jīvaka; v. 53.
2. Jīvaka; v, 480.
3. Ibid; v. 1866.
4. Jīvaka; v. 341.
5. Ibid; v. 1335.
6. Ibid; v. 1786.
7. Kali; v. 8:1.

action in the mind becomes explicit by its materialisation, but here the minister is said to draw (vāṅka) the action from his mind. Action in the mind is not anything to be drawn out literally. This is a metaphorical usage. Naccinārkkiniyar describes this convention illustrating another statement like this. 'Virutti vāṅka'. There is also another instance for this in his commentary,

'Katir mukantena'.[1]

Here 'katir' means 'light' and 'mukattal'—to bale or to draw or to measure out like water. Water is to be drawn, but light is to be seen and not to be drawn. But here the light is said to be drawn and so this is also classified under the convention mentioned above, according to Naccinārkkiniyar.

10.2.12, *The cause for the effect*

There are places in Naccinārkkiniyar's commentary where the word denoting the cause is used in the sense of effect and vice versa. If nouns are used like this they are classified as Kāraṇa ākupeyar and Kāriya ākupeyar respectively. Here the verbs which denote the cause are used for denoting the effect. There is an instance for this in Naccinārkkiniyar's commentary.

'Pōltu uḷḷār turantār'[2]

Here Naccinārkkiniyar interprets the word 'turantār' (separated) as 'marantār' (forgot). Forgetting occurs only during separation. Separation is the cause and forgetting is the effect and so cause denotes the effect here according to Naccinārkkiniyar. Because the separation has already occurred, there is no meaning in repeating it; therefore it has been interpreted as 'he forgot'. Since this will be clear from the context, the poet emphasises the cause even when referring to the effect. Other commentators, in such places, say that 'the cause is used figuratively as the effect' (kāraṇam kāriyamāka upacarikka-p-paṭṭatu).[3]

10.2.13. *The effect for the cause*

This is the opposite of the previous. The verb denoting the effect is used in the sense of cause.

"Viḷai puṉam niḷattalin kēḷal"[4]

1. Jīvaka; v. 323.
2. Kali; v. 29:14.
3. Kuṟaḷ. Pari ; v; 369.
4. Malai. 1. 193.

Here the boars are described as eating the millet crops. Ni̲lattal is interpreted by Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar as meaning 'eating'. Ni̲lattal normally means to decrease. Tolkāppiyar says it is 'uḷḷataṉ nuṇuk-kam'—the decrease of a thing.[1] So 'eating' is not a direct meaning of 'ni̲lattal'. But as the boars go on eating, the crops are decreasing. Eating is the cause and the decreasing is the effect. The verb denoting the effect is used to refer to the cause here. So this can be called 'the effect for the cause'. The poet wants to emphasise the destruction caused to the fields by the boars eating away the millet. Therefore, though he has to speak only of the eating, refers to it in terms of the effect caused by the boars i.e. by their eating. That is the feature for this figurative usage. Other commentators call this "the effect is used figurative as the cause" (kāriyam kāraṇamāka upacarikkapp-paṭṭatu).[2]

10.2.14. *Affiramative for negative*

There are places where the words sometimes refer to the opposite sense or negative meanings.

"aruvi āṉṟa ... malai" [3]

This Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar interprets as meaning "the hill without falls". Āṉṟa naturally means 'full of'. But here the word is given exactly the opposite meaning. There are also other instances for semantic change in the commentary of Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar.

	Word	*Natural*	*Negative meaning.*
1.	ni̲lal	shade	light.[4]
2.	tiruntu	good	bad.[5]
3.	amai	exist	not to exist.[6]
4.	aḻital	to decay	to multiply.[7]
5.	mēṉāḷ	the previous day	the future day.[8]
6.	uyttal	cause to reach	cause to leave.[9]

1. Tol. Col; s. 330.
2. Kuṟaḷ. Pari; v. 425.
3. Maturai; l. 306.
4. Jīvaka; v. 2672.
5. Jīvaka; v. 2535.
6. Ibid, v. 1258; Kali; v. 82:35.
7. Jīvaka; v. 1193. Maturai; l. 544.
8. Kali; v. 72:12.
9. Jīvaka; v. 2481.

10.2.15 *Negative for affiramative*

This is the opposite of the previous. Here the negative gives the affirmative meaning.

"ceyyāy en̲n̲um mun̲n̲ilai vin̲ai-c-col
cey en̲ kiḷavi ākiṭan̲ uṭaittē"[1]

ceyyāy, a symbolic type of negative verb belonging to the second person, can give the affirmative meaning also. This is Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar's interpretation. According to this, the word 'uṇṇāy' can give two meanings. 1. Do not eat. 2. Do eat (negative as well as affirmative). Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar states that this word, by its suggestive accent, will give the affirmative meaning, the accentual system of which we have discussed elsewhere in this thesis. Sometimes, in lover's talk the words denote their opposite meanings as understood from Kaliṅkattu-p-paraṇi.[2]

10.2.16. *The place used for the time*

In Tamil, perhaps to start with, time and place were not differentiated. So much so same words may be interpreted as referring to time and place, mun̲, pin̲, etc. Even time words are interpreted as place words-vantakkāl as vanta iṭattu and vice versa. The locative case itself means not only the locative of place but also the locative of time.[3] But in course of time, time and place become distinguished and the peculiar usage developed in Tamil with reference to these has to be examined in terms of semantic development.

Varumē tōḷi nan̲ malai nāṭan̲
Vēṅkai viriviṭam nōkki
Vīnkir̲ai-p-paṇai-t-tōḷ varaintanan̲ koḷar̲kē[4]

The maid tells the heroine that the hero would come and marry her, as is understood by the blossoming time of the Vēṅkai flowers. Here "Vēṅkai viriviṭam" means literally the place of the blossoming. But it is interpreted as the time of the blossoming tree.

There are a few more examples. The men and women go swimming, Their joyous and happy cry on this occasion is like the cheers of those who churn the sea with the Himalayas as the churningstuff, and Vāsuki as the rope, to extract nectar out of it.

---

1. Tol. Col.; s. 450.
2. Kaliṅkattupparaṇi; v. 25.
3. Tol. Col; s. 82.
4. Kali; v. 38: 24-26.

"attalai ala̱ra mun̲n̲īr kaṭaintavar"[1]

Here the poet says 'attalai'. This literally means 'at that place'. But Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar interprets attalai as 'at that time' i.e. 'in those days'. The word denoting the place refers to the time here.

There is another instance. 'Nuti' means the front part of an implement. But Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar interprets the word as meaning just previously.

"Vēr̲r̲ai vantan̲n̲a nuti vemparar̲ kān̲am"[2]

'The forest with hard stones of very sharp points'. Here 'nuti' naturally means sharp point'. But Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar separates 'nuti' from this and states 'nuti' means 'just before' i.e. 'before Jīvakan̲ reached the place, Vijaiyai went to the forest'. Here also the word denoting the place (nuti) refers to the time, Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar illustrates this point quoting from Tiruccir̲r̲ampalakkōvaiyār where the same word 'nuti' occurs in the sense of time.

10.2.17. *The place for the thing in the place*

The name referring to the place sometimes is interpreted as meaning the thing in that place.

"Kōtai cintaiyin̲ nīṭṭin̲āḷē"[3]

The meaning of this passage as explained by Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar is that Tattai had a long mental suffering. 'Cintai' normally means 'mind'. But according to Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar it denotes the activity of the mind, 'the long suffering'. This shift in meaning has become so well established that 'cintai' means painful contemplation. The Tamil scholars call such occurrences as 'Iṭavāku peyar'.

10.2.18. *A thing in a place for its abstract quality*

There are places where the thing in the place refers to its characteristic feature of the greatness by its very being there.

"Tilaka veṇ kuṭai"[4]

Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar interprets this as meaning 'the great Royal umbrella'. 'Tilakam' is stretched to give the meaning 'great'. Tilakam

1. Jīvaka; v. 963.
2. Jīvaka; v. 1933.
3. Jīvaka; v. 1701.
4. Jīvaka; v. 183.

is that which is put on the forehead, an important and conspicuous part in a human body. What occurs in a great place is also great, and hence Naccinārkkiniyar interprets this word 'tilakam' as 'great'. This is an implied metaphor. There is a distinction between ākupeyar and uvamai in Tolkāppiyam. The second relates to the shifts based on similarity where as the first denotes all other shifts which may be roughly stated to be on the basis of contiguity. Unfortunately this important distinction was lost sight of and people began to speak of 'uvama ākupeyar'. One will be tempted to call the 'tilakam' as poruḷ ākupeyar but it is really uvama ākupeyar, the common part of comparison is the height of glory.

10.3. *Grammatical Changes*

10.3.1. *Exclusive and inclusive First person*

'Yān' is the first person singular noun and 'yām' and 'nām' are the first person plural. "First person denoting the speaker alone should always be in the singular only. When it occurs as plural it has to include the second person or the third person or both together."[1] Tolkāppiyar has laid down the verb suffixes for the first person plural and the commentators have analysed them thoroughly with reference to their inclusiveness.[2]

The grammarians have clearly analysed the usage of 'yām' and 'nām' with reference to their inclusiveness till the nineteenth century. Nām and nāṅkaḷ are two words in common currency. Nām includes the second person or the second and third together. The real point is whether the first person plural includes the person spoken to i.e. the second person or not. 'Nāṅkaḷ' is used as an exclusive first person not including the second person, but sometimes including the the third person with the speaker. But there should have been a time when nām and nāṅkaḷ could have been used in the same sense. 'Kaḷ' is a plural suffix for 'nām' in addition to the plural sense of the word (nām) denoted by the final 'm'.[3] But today nām and nāṅkaḷ, differ as words and in their meanings with referenee to their inclusiveness.

From a study of Naccinārkkiniyar, we are able to distinguish between yām and nām. The maid addresses the heroine,

---

1. Tol. Col; Cēṉā; s. 202.
2. Tol. Col. Iḷam; s. 199.,
   Tol. Col. Cēṉā; 202.,
   Tol. Col; s. 204.
3. Jīvaka; v. 1762.

"Teriyiḻāy nīyum niṉ kēḷum puṇara
Varaiyuṟai teyvam uvappa uvantu
kuravai taḻīi yām āṭa-k-kuravaiyuṭ
koṇṭu nilai pāṭi-k-kāṇ",[1]

"you sing the song for kuravai dance, so that you and your husband can join together, the God of the mountain be pleased and we (yām), happy as we are, will dance the kuravai". Here the maid says "we (yām) will dance the kuravai", yām means "she (maid) and the other girls, excluding the heroine (the second person)" and so Naccinārkkiṉiyar says that this 'yām' (I person plural pronoun) includes the 'āyam' (the other girls), the third person. The real point is not the inclusion so much as the exclusion. So it is clear that 'yām' was used once, including only the third person, excluding the person spoken to.

From the above investigation we can understand that the other word 'nām' includes the second person. We can prove this by illustrating a passage from Kalittokai where

1. the hero, when addressing the heroine, says 'nām'.[2]
2. the heroine while addressing the maid, says 'nām'.[3]

So yām is used as the first person exclusive plural pronoun excluding the second person and including the third person and nām is used as the first person inclusive plural pronoun including the second person and also the third person if necessary. Dr. P.S.S. Sastri would appear to be wrong in saying that there is no such difference between yām and nām.[4]

10.3.2. *Third person used for the other persons*

There are instances in the commentry of Naccinārkkiṉiyar where the third person is used for the first or second person. But it should be noted that the first and second personal pronouns are not used in the sense of third person. We can classify the third personal pronoun that occurs in the sense of first person as "first personal third person" ("taṉmai-p-paṭarkkai") and the third person occuring in the sense of "second personal third person" ("muṉṉillai-p-paṭarkkai"). Naccinārkkiṉiyar refers to the latter at many places.

---

1. Kali; v. 39:26-29.
2. Kali. v. 93:11.
3. Ibid; v. 60:26.
4. Tol. Col. with an English commentary; s. 162, p. 149.

10.3.3. *Taṉmai-p-paṭarkkai (first personal third person)*

The daughter of the cowherds says that she would definitely marry the hero, come what may.

> Peṟṟattār kavvai eṭuppa atu peritu
> Uṟṟīyāḷ āyar makaḷ.[1]

She says that "āyar makaḷ", the daughter of the cowherd, would never feel afraid of the gossip in the town with reference to her love affair with the hero. She, referring to her own-self, first person, uses the third person "āyarmakaḷ" — "the daughter of the cowherds". Āyarmakaḷ, the third personal subject is interpreted by Naccinārkkiṉiyar as 'I', first personal subject and uṟṟīyāḷ, third personal predicate as (I) would never feel," first personal predicate. Naccinārkkiṉiyar's commentary explains such usages. This is a usage still met with even in colloquial speech. What will be merely personal statement when the first person is used assumes the validity of a general statement where the act is taken as something natural of the noun replacing the first person. Here 'āyar makaḷ' implies that it is true of all āyar makaḷ or of the unique daughter of the shepherds.

10 3.4. *Muṉṉilai-p-paṭarkkai (second personal third person)*

There are places in literary works where the second person also occurs in the third person. In other words the third person is used in the sense of second person.

> "empiyai īṅku-p-peṟṟēṉ".[2]

It means "I have got (you), my brother' as interpreted by Naccinārkkiṉiyar. Here 'empi' (my brother) is the third person used in the second personal sense, as explained by Naccinārkkiṉiyar. The brother is there, and the speech is addressed to him. Instead of using the word 'you', the third person also raises the statement to a universal level from the merely personal level. Here the third personal word occuring in the first personal sense, shows some self-conscious greatness, but the third person used in the second personal sense, shows a high form of respect. This is understood from the common usage of thesewords,

1. 'Ivar yārukkum añcamāṭṭār'.
   'This person (referring to one's own self)

---

1. Kali; v. 104: 67-68.
2. Jīvaka; v. 1760,

is not afraid of anybody' — self-conscious greatness.

2. Taṅkaḷukku vēṇṭuvatu yātu?
What is required by him?
Taṅkaḷukku — refers to the second person
here — a high form of respect.

The distinction is understood from the examples above mentioned. This case of third person for the second person has gained an important place in Tamil akam poetry. Such kinds of statements are called "munnilai-p-puṟa moḷi'.[1] The hero will be outside the house of the heroine. The companion of the heroine and the heroine will be conversing between themselves as though unaware of the hero's presence but with the intention of the hero's hearing this conversation. This gives an opportunity to express certain thoughts which they may not express in conversation with the hero addressing him in the second person.[2] This use of the third person for the second person has therefore poetic advantages as well.

10.3.5 *First person in the third personal verbs*

"Tarutal' (to give) and 'varutal' (to come) occur with reference to first and second persons, koṭuttal' (to give), and cellutal' (to go) occur with reference to third person — according to Tolkāppiyar.[3] This restriction did not hold good in the post-Tolkāppiyam period where these words violate their prescribed boundary and Naccinārkkiniyar describes all these changes. There are certain other changes which have occurred with reference to the use of certain verbs.

The verbs 'koṭuttal' and 'cellutal' designated for the third person occur in the first personal sense.

"Vēṟu vēṟu uyarnta mutu vāy okkal
Cāṟu ayar mūtūr ceṉṟu tokkāṅku"[4]

"The people belonging to various classes came here and settled down in this old town". 'Here' i. e. in this town' (i. e. where I am) is first person and 'ceṉṟu' (having gone) is third person as the predicate of 'okkal', the relatives. "Gone here' is a wrong construction and so Naccinārkkiniyar interprets this word 'ceṉṟu'(gone) as 'vantu' (come). According to him 'ceṉṟu' the third personal verb occurs here in the first personal sense i. e. 'vantu' — 'having come' (and settled here).

1. Tol, Poruḷ s. 167.
2. Kali; v. 22, Kuṟuntokai; v. 47.
3. Tol. Col; ss. 29, 30.
4. Paṭṭinam; 11. 214-215, p. 551.

10.3.6 *Third person in the first and second*

The other two verbs 'tarutal' and 'varutal' designated for first person occur with reference to the third personal sense.

"Pāṇar uvappa-k-kaḷiṟu pala tarīi"[1]

Here it means that the king gave many elephants to the musicians so that they would feel happy. Here the verb used is 'tarutal', a verb belonging to the first and second persons (i. e. their object will be first or second person) to be used as:

Eṉakku-t-tantāṉ — he gave me.

Niṉakku-t-tantāṉ — he gave you.

But 'tarīi', the first or second personal verb is used in the sense of third person as it occurs as "Pāṇarkku-t-tantāṉ' and Pāṇar is the third person.

10.3.7. *Reconciliation with Tolkāppiyam sūtram*

Tolkāppiyar, on the basis of the currency of these words at his time, must have prescribed the rules, but if they violate his rules it could have happened only after his time. But it is strange that Tolkāppiyam is quoted to justify these changes. Tolkāppiyar has stated that all the four words occur in three persons and then specified their place of occurrence.[2] It is not that he has prescribed that all of them can occur in any of the three persons, because, if so, he need not have specified the restriction in the succeeding sūtrams. Instead of trying to speak of these altered usages as being prescribed by Tolkāppiyar, these must be explained as changes which have occurred in their meaning and usage in the post-Tolkāppiyam period.

10.3.8. *Non-ergative for the ergative*

There are places where the non-ergative verbs occur in the sense of ergative verbs. The fertile Emāṅkata country is described. 'As the coconut fruit fell and in its wake the honey comb in the kamuku flowers broke the petals and flowed the mangoes and banana got scattered all over'. Here the words 'kīḻi', 'pōḻntu', 'citaṟi', and 'cintum' are used and all of them are non-ergative verbs.[3] But Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar says that they can be interpreted as ergative verbs also. The coconut fruit broke the honey comb, scattered the mangoes and so on. In the first interpretation 'kīṟutal', 'pōḷtal" 'citṟal',

1. Maturai; 1. 219.
2. Tol. Col; ss. 28-30.
3. Jīvaka; v. 31.

etc. are all non-ergative and in the second interpretation they occur in the sense of ergatives. Naccinārkkiniyar quotes another word in this connection from Tiruccirrampala-k-kōvaiyār where the word 'viṇṭu' meaning to blow, a non-ergative, occurs as meaning 'to make the other blowing' in the ergative sense.[1]

10.3.9. *The ergative for the non-ergative*

There is another place where Naccinārkkiniyar gives non-ergative meaning for an ergative verb. The kings who are defeated in the yāḻ competition and failed to get the hand of Tattai, address Jīvakan and say "you, being a merchant, do not know how to do business." The passage is this:

"vāṇikam onrum tērrāy"[2]

Here the word that occurs meaning 'do not know' is 'tērrāy'. Tēray is the non-ergative and tērrāy, the ergative. But here tērrāy is used in the non-ergative sense. There is no sanction for this grammatically, but in literature such occurrences are common and Naccinārkkiniyar holds perhaps that literary usage has precedence over grammar. In this connection he quotes from Puranānūru, 'tērrāy peruma poyyē"[3] and justifies his interpretation. These may be looked upon as changes in grammatical usage, but they are treated here as changes in meaning which they are.

10.3.10 *Another change*

There is another grammatical change which can also be dealt with under Semantic change. The word ending in Kaḷ occurs, according to Tolkāppiyar, in akriṇai,[4] but this has changed in later times. 'Kaḷ' has come to occur even in the uyartiṇai plural. When we take the whole word into consideration there is a semantic change: For instance: The word 'Kuḷavi' meaning child (superior category) occurs with 'kaḷ' suffix as 'kuḷavikaḷ' meaning 'children', as against Tolkāppiyar.[5] But Tolkāppiyar has sanctioned this kind of change in meaning and it shows his broad outlook. His sūtram is this:

"kaṭi col illai-k-kālattu-p-paṭinē"[6]

It means 'one cannot avoid words which become current'. Naccinārkkiniyar refers to this rule and justifies this semantic change.

1. Tirukkōvaiyār; v. 24.
2. Jīvaka; v. 770.
3. Puram; v. 59.
4. Tol. Col; s. 171.
5. Jīvaka; v. 2834.
6. Tol. Col; s. 452.

10.3.11. *Ceyyum — as viyaṅkōḷ*

The word ceyyum has also thus changed its meaning. Naccinārkkiniyar interprets the meaning of the 'ceyyum forms' in a way that delights an aesthetic critic as well as a grammarian. King Caccantaṉ tells Kaṭṭiyaṅkāraṉ,

"Vaiyam icai paṭa-k-kāttal vēṇṭum"[1]

It means, 'be you the king and protect the country." Here the word 'vēṇṭum' is viyaṅkōḷ (verb of the potential mood) according to Naccinārkkiniyar. The viyaṅkōḷ is of two kinds (1) ēval kaṇṇiya viyaṅkōḷ, (2) ēval kaṇṇāta viyaṅkōḷ. Here he calls this as ēval kaṇṇiya viyaṅkōḷ and quotes a similar usage in Puṟanāṉūṟu — "Vāḷtal Vēṇṭum ivaṉ varainta vaikal"[2]. We have seen elsewhere the difference between these two varieties.[3]

10,3.12. *Ceyyum — as second person plural*

In Kalittokai, the early part of summer is described. Here the word used is 'koḷḷum' (please have them').[4] Naccinārkkiniyar holds this 'ceyyum' as second personal plural and quotes his commentary on a sūtram in Tolkāppiyam where he says that 'um' can refer to second personal plural.[5] But this is reading too much into Tolkāppiyam. This is really a change in meaning which had come into currency at a later time. Naccinārkkiniyar has however noted the change in the meaning. But the next question is whether this change had occurred in the age of Kalittokai. In the prticular example given, it is possible to interpret the word as an ēval kaṇṇiya viyaṅkōḷ as he has interpreted vēṇṭum.

1. Jīvaka; v. 201.
2. Puṟam; v. 367.
3. Supra: 6.3.2.
4. Kali: 32; 16-17.
5. Tol. Col: s. 226, p. 237.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Course in Modern Linguistics — Charles F. Hockett, The Macmillan Company, New York (1959).

A History of Tamil Literature — C. Jesudasan and Hephzibah Jesudasan, Y. M. C. A. Publishing House, Calcutta-16. First edition (1961).

Aiṅkuṟunūṟu — S. I. S. S. W. P. Society,[1] Madras (1961).

Akanāṉūṟu — S. I. S. S. W. P. Society, Madras (1961).

An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics — H. A. Gleason, Jr. —Henry Holt and Company, New York (1958).

An Introduction to the Study of Literature — William Henry Hudson-George G. Harrap & Co., Ltd., London (1954).

Bhārathiyār Kavithaikaḷ — Subramaniya Bharathi — Srimakal Company III Edition (1962).

Cāsaṉa-t-tamiḻ-k-kavi Caritam — Rev. Sahib — M. Ragavaiyangar — Second edition (1958).

Cilappatikāram - Iḷaṅkōvaṭikaḷ — Pakaneri T. V. I. Tamil Cankam[2] Publication, (1942).

Ciṟupāṇāṟṟuppaṭai -- Nattattaṉār — Dr. U. V. Swaminatha Aiyar's Pattuppāṭṭu - Fourth Edition (1950).

Essentials of English Grammar — Otto Jesperson — London, George Allen & Unwin Ltd., (1954).

History of the Tamil Language — V. G. Suryanarayana Sastriar (1927).

Ilakkiya-k-kalai — A. S. Gnanasambandan — S. I. S. S. W. P. Society, Madras (1960).

---

1. S. I. S. S. W. P. Society — The South India Saiva Siddhanta Works Publishing Society.
2. T. V. I. Tamil Caṅkam — Taṉa Vaisya Iḷaiñar Caṅkam.

Ilakkiya-t-tiran — Dr. M. Varadarajan, Tayakam Publication (1959).

Tamiḻ Ilakkiyavaralāṟu — T. V. Sadasiva Pandaratthar — Annamalai University Publication (1963).

Iraiyanār Kaḷaviyal – K. Namasivaya Mudaliar — Edition — C. N. N. & Sons., Madras (1943).

Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi — Tiruttakka Tevar — Dr. U. V. Swaminatha Aiyar's sixth edition.

Jivaka Cintāmaṇi ārāycci — Avvai S. Doraiswami Pillai — S. I. S. S. W. P. Society, Madras (1943).

Kaliṅkattu-p-paraṇi — Jayaṅkoṇṭār — S. I. S. S. W. P. Society, Madras (1961).

Kalittokai — Pakaneri T. V. I. Tamil Cankam Publication (1938).

Kalittokai-c-coṟpoḻivukaḷ — S. I. S. S. W. P. Society, Madras (1940).

Kamparāmāyaṇam — Cuntarakāṇṭam — V. M. Gopalakrishnamachariyar Edition, Madras (1963).

Kantaralaṅkāram — Arunagirinathar, Vaṭakkuppaṭṭu, T. Subramaiya Pillai's Edition (1926).

Karikālar mūvar — *V. S. Subramania achariyar* — Avvainulakam, Madras, First Edition (1958).

Kuṟiñci-p-pāṭṭu — *Kapilar* — *Dr. U. V. Swaminatha Aiyar's Pattup-pāṭṭu* — Fourth Edition (1950).

Kuṟuntokai — S. I. S. S. W. P. Society, Madras (1961).

Language — *Leonard Bloomfield* — Published by Sundarlal Jain, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi-6 (1963).

Malaipaṭukaṭām — *Peruṅkaucikaṉār* — Dr. U. V. Swaminatha Aiyar's Pattuppāṭṭu Fourth Edition (1950).

Maturai-k-kāñci — *Maṅkuṭi Marutaṉār* — Dr. U. V. Swaminatha Aiyar's Pattu-p-pāṭṭu Fourth Edition (1950).

Moḻi nūl — *Dr. M. Varadarajan* — S. I. S. S. W. P. Society, Madras. Revised Edition (1958).

Mullai-p-pāṭṭu — *Nappūtaṉār* — Dr. U. V. Swaminatha Aiyar's Pāṭṭu-p-pattu Fourth Edition (1950).

Mullai-p-pāṭṭu — *Ārāycciyurai* — *Maṟaimalai Aṭikaḷ* — S. I. S. S. W. P. Society, Madras (1958).

Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar — *M. Annamalai* — Tolkappiyar Nulakam, Chidambaram — Second Edition (1963).

Nālaṭiyār — V. M. Gopalakrishnamachariyar's Edition (1946).

Naṉṉūl — Arumuga Navalar's Edition — Chidambaram (1957).

Neṭunalvāṭai — Nakkīrar Dr. U. V. Swaminatha Aiyar's Pattu-p-pāṭṭu, Fourth Edition (1950).

Paḻa moḻi — Muṉṟuṟai Araiyaṉār — S. I. S. S. W. P. Society, Madras (1963).

Paṭṭiṉa-p-pālai — Uruttiraṅkaṇṇaṉār — Dr. U. V. Swaminatha Aiyar's Pattu-p-pāṭṭu Fourth Edition (1950).

Pattu-p-pāṭṭu — Dr. U.V. Swaminatha Aiyar's Fourth Edition (1950).

Pattu-p-pāṭṭu-c-coṟpoḻivukaḷ — S. I. S. S. W. P. Society, Madras (1957).

Perumpāṇāṟṟuppaṭai — Uruttiraṅkaṇṇaṉār — Dr. U. V. Swaminatha Aiyar's Pattu-p-pāṭṭu Fourth Edition (1950).

Poetry and the Ordinary Reader — M. R. Ridley — London, G. Bell and Sons Ltd., (1930).

Porunarāṟṟuppaṭai — Muṭattāma-k-kaṇṇiyār — Dr. U. V. Swaminatha Aiyar's Pattu-p-pāṭṭu, Fourth Edition (1950).

Puṟanāṉūṟu — Dr. U. V. Swaminatha Aiyar's Edition.

Some Principles of Literary Criticism — C. T. Winchestor.

Tamil Lexicon — Madras University Publication (1926).

Taṇṭi Alaṅkāram — S. I S. S. W. P. Society, Madras, Second Edition (1943).

The Discovery of Poetry — P. H. B. Lyon.

The Tamil concept of Love in Ahattiṇai — Dr. V. SP. Manickam, S. I. S. S. W. P, Society, Madras (1962).

The Theory of Speech and Language — Sir. Alan. Gardiner — Clarendon Press, Oxford, Second Edition (1951).

Tirukkuṟaḷ — Tiruvaḷḷuvar — with Parimelalakar's Commentary S. I. S. S. W. P. Society, Madras — Sixth Edition (1948).

Tiru-k-kōvaiyār — Māṇikkavācakar — Arumuga Navalar, Chidambaram Edition.

Tirumurukāṟṟuppaṭai — Nakkīrar — Dr. U. V. Swaminatha Aiyar's Pattu-p-pāṭṭu, Fourth Edition (1950).

Tiruvācakam — Māṇikkavācakar — Tiruppanantal Kasi Mutt Edition (1950).

Tolkāppiya ārāycci — C. Ilakkuvanar — Valluvar Patippakam, Pudukkotai (1961).

Tolkāppiya-c-cūttira virutti — Civananasuvamikal — Arumuga Navalar, Chidambaram, Fourth Edition.

Tolkāppiyam Collatikāram — Cēṉāvaraiyar Commentary — Arumuga Navalar, Chidambaram, Second Edition (1934).

Tolkāppiyam-Collatikāram. Iḷampūraṇar Commentary — K. Namasivaya Mudaliar, Madras-Edition (1927).

Tolkāppiyam-Collatikāram. Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar Commentary — Tanjore Sarasvathi Mahal Publication (1962).

Tolkāppiyam-Collatikāram. Teyvaccilaiyār Commentary — Karantai-t-tamil — Cankam — Edition (1929).

Tolkāppiyam-Collatikāram with an English Commentary by Dr. P. S. Subramanya Sastri — Annamalai University Publication (1945).

Tolkāppiyam — Eḻuttatikāram. Iḷampūraṇar Commentary — Published by V. O. Chidambaram Pillai, Tuttukkuti (1941).

Tolkāppiyam — Eḻuttatikāram. Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar Commentary — Edited by C. Ganesa Aiyar, Ceylon (1937).

Tolkāppiyam — Poruḷatikāram. English Translation by E. S. Varadaraja Iyer — Published by the Annamalai University (1948).

Tolkāppiyam — Poruḷatikāram. Iḷampūraṇar Commentary — S. I. S. S. W. P. Society, Madras (1956).

Tolkāppiyam — Poruḷatikāram, Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar commentary — Edited by C, Ganesa Aiyar, Ceylon (1948).

Tolkāppiyam — Poruḷatikāram, Pērāciriyar Commentary, Edited by C. Ganesa Aiyar, Ceylon (1943).

Tolkāppiyam — Poruṭpaṭalam, Meyppāṭṭiyal — Dr. S, Somasundara Bharathi Commentary, First Edition (1942).

T. P. M. Maṇivilā malar — Kalaikkatir, Coimbatore Publication (1961),

---